DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 072 EA 003 193

AUTHOR	Hooker, Clifford P.; Mueller, Van D.
TITLE	The Relationship of School District Reorganization to State Aid Distribution Systems. Part I: Patterns of School District Organization.
INSTITUTION	Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	NEFP-Special Study-11
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	196p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Finance, *Intermediate Administrative Units, *Regional Programs, School Districts, *School Organization, School Statistics, *State Aid, *State School District Relationship, State Surveys, Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS	ESEA Title V

ABSTRACT

This report consists of the basic documentation concerning a study of the impact of school district organization on State support programs. State aid programs for school district reorganization and other statutory provisions affecting school district reorganization were identified through a survey of the 48 contiguous States. Included are state-by-state discussions of (1) local school district organization, (2) regional and intermediate units, and (3) state aid to local districts. Statistical data are appended. Research for this report was funded under ESEA Title V. (Related documents are EA 003 123 and EA 003 192. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (Author/LLR)

ED046072

The Relationship of School District Reorganization to State Aid Distribution Systems

Part I
Patterns of School District Organization

Clifford P. Hooker and Van D. Mueller

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EA 003 193

NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL FINANCE PROJECT
Special Study Eleven

1

ED046072

THE RELATIONSHIP OF SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION TO STATE AID DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS

PART I: PATTERNS OF SCHOOL DISTRICT ORGANIZATION

Clifford P. Hooker, Director, and
Van D. Mueller, Associate Director

Financed by funds provided under the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
(Public Law 89-10, Title V, Sec. 505) and
sponsoring states.

1970

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL OF
THE TWIN CITIES METROPOLITAN AREA, INC.
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents ii

Foreword iii

Chapter I - Introduction 1

Chapter II
Organization for Local School Districts
State by State Description 7

Chapter III
Regional and Intermediate Units
State by State Profiles 57

Chapter IV
State Aids to Local Districts
State by State Review 84

APPENDIX

A. National Educational Finance Project. 135

B. Contact Personnel in States 136

C. Glossary of Definitions 137

D. Author Vitae. 141

E. Statistical Data 143

FOREWORD

The National Educational Finance Project (NEFP) is a cooperative endeavor, funded principally under Title V, Section 505, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, involving state departments of education, universities and the United States Office of Education in the study of contemporary problems in financing education. The project represents the first systematic effort to study comprehensively all state systems of school finance and to critique them in the light of current educational needs and trends. The project is designed to accomplish three major objectives: (1) identify, measure and interpret deviations in educational needs among children, school districts and states; (2) relate variations in educational needs to the ability of the school district and state to finance appropriate educational programs; and (3) conceptualize various models of school finance and subject them to consequential analysis to identify the strengths and weaknesses of each model.

To accomplish the comprehensive project objectives eleven special projects were developed and conducted by university-based school finance consultants. The special project "The Relationship of School District Organization To State Aid Distribution Systems," was directed by Clifford P. Hooker and conducted under contract between the Florida State Department of Education (National Educational Finance Project) and the Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities, Inc.

This report, Part I, consists of basic documentation concerning a study of the impact of school district organization on state support programs. State support provisions concerning school district reorganization and other statutory provisions which affect school district reorganization were identified by a survey of the 48 contiguous states. This survey provided data which was utilized to select a sample of states which provide a range of situations with regard to provisions for school district reorganization. The second part of this report contains analyses and conclusions regarding the interaction between fiscal provisions and school district reorganization in the sample states. Part II also includes the findings of treatments of various hypotheses concerning the relationship.

The documentation in this report is the result of the original fact-finding effort during which the state education agencies cooperated closely with the project staff in collecting and refining the data base. Of particular assistance to the project staff has been the contact person in each of the state education agencies. A list of these persons is included in the Appendix. Much of the credit for the intensive research effort to provide basic documentation on the patterns of school district organization and support in the respective states should go to project research assistants John Feda, James Lindsay, David L. Wettergren and John Young. The project staff has had effective assistance in data tabulation and manuscript preparation from Thresia Moen and Helen Warhol, project secretaries.

During the course of the data collection activities of this project there were many other persons who were contributors. The wholesome cooperation of many interested persons permitted the securing of data to proceed in a timely manner. The authors, however, assume full responsibility for any limitations in the completeness and accuracy of the data presented herein.

Minneapolis, Minnesota
Spring, 1970

Clifford P. Hooker
Project Director

Van D. Mueller
Associate Director

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Purpose of the Study

The constitutions in all states contain language to the effect that the legislature has the responsibility for maintaining a thorough and efficient system of public education, free to all young people within certain age limits. In fulfilling this obligation, legislatures have generally enacted statutes to permit the formation and reorganization of local school units. While most of the responsibilities for operating the schools have been delegated to these local units, legally public education remains a function of the state. Moreover, the United States Supreme Court in Brown v Board of Education[1] held that educational opportunity within a state must be made available to all on equal terms.

State provisions for education generally fall far short of this goal. Scarcity of state resources and faulty state aid distribution systems account for much of the observed disparity in educational opportunity within states. Likewise, an inadequate local school district structure contributes to the problem. The condition is often characterized by an overabundance of districts, many of which have limited resources and miniscule school populations. Other districts have been gerrymandered to create islands of tax privilege for some, while leaving swamps of squalor for their neighbors. Also, the flight of the more prosperous urban dwellers to the affluent suburbs and a subsequent tightening of lines between the core city and its suburbs have introduced social, economic, and race stratification as well as geographic separation. Equality of education is more a myth than a reality in many of the areas of the nation.

The legislatures in the several states are confronted with perplexing problems as they seek to satisfy constitutional mandates and court decrees relative to good schools for all. Three options seem to offer some promise. The states can direct more resources to those school districts with the greatest needs; establish regional or intermediate districts to collect and distribute taxes to local operating districts; and create a more efficient school district organization through legislative fiat. Twenty-four states have adopted legislation forcing the abolition of certain types of school districts. However, political considerations have often deterred legislatures from bold action to reorganize schools. A few states have attempted to manipulate school aids in a fashion to encourage local districts in forming stronger units through consolidation. Also, several states are experimenting with regional approaches which are calculated to equalize tax levies and the quality of schools in multi-county areas. The conditions which contribute to the success or failure of these efforts are not understood because there is a paucity of empirical research evidence to guide the decision-makers.

Opposing forces appear to be operating in the area of school district reorganization. Concern for economical school operation has been a prime consideration in the move to develop more effective school district organizations in many states. At the same time, legislatures in some states have increased state levels of school support under conditions that have subsidized ineffective and inefficient administrative units. Likewise, state aids in metropolitan areas virtually insure a separate and unequal existence for cities and suburbs.

1.

State aid formulas are political responses to educational needs and may be classified as neutral, favorable, or negative with regard to school district reorganization. These responses are often generated without adequate theoretical and policy frameworks derived from empirical research. There is a dearth of research findings in the literature dealing with this problem. More knowledge is needed to develop conceptual models for the distribution of the resources allocated to education in order to relate the educational institution to the emerging patterns of contemporary society.

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of state school aids to local school district organization. Data on expenditure per pupil, level of state support, local school tax rates, and the nature of the aid distribution mechanism were obtained from a selected sample of states. The criteria to guide the selection of the sample was developed from a thorough study of related literature, the state school district organization patterns, and aid distribution systems in the 48 contiguous states. This report volume contains the basic data documentation developed prior to sample selection. This information has been analyzed to ascertain the relationship of general aids and special incentive aids to the extent and type of district reorganization. Conclusions concerning these relationships are based on tested hypotheses utilizing the collected data. These analyses and conclusions are reported in report Volume II.

A second purpose of this study was to examine the financing of regional or intermediate units. The principal focus of this portion of the project was on the financial provisions which are designed to achieve equal educational opportunity. Special attention was directed toward the capacity of intermediate units to levy taxes and distribute this revenue as well as state aids to local school districts. All states with provisions for multi-county intermediate units are included in this portion of the study.

Hopefully, the outputs of the study will provide needed additional inputs to Phase IV of the National Educational Finance Project which proposes to design model programs of school support.

There is a conspicuous absence of reported research relative to the relationship between state aid distribution systems and school district organization. This is strange in that many experts in school finance have noted that such a relationship does exist. There are no studies which have attempted to measure this relationship; therefore, all of the knowledge is purely speculative. This may be true because only a few states have made direct grants to encourage the adoption of district organization plans. Moreover, the amount of incentive aids provided typically is miniscule when compared to the amount of money distributed through the general state support program. (Few of the states have adopted financial penalties; that is, deny some state monies to districts for failing to reorganize.) In fact, many states have provisions in their laws which may actually discourage school district reorganization. These provisions take many forms, the most common being a reduction in state aids to one or more partners in the reorganization with less aid available to the new district than is now being paid to the several separate districts. Another example pertains to a limitation on bonding capacity in the new district. Also, some states have included sparsity factors in their state aid formulas which encourage the continuation of small inefficient districts.

Therefore, the research reported in Parts I and II of this study is unique, in that it contains a study of those elements in state aid distribution systems

which encourage or retard the reorganization of school districts. The need for such reorganization is widespread and continuing. The shift in population, change in economic factors, and technological advances make it mandatory that the organization for education respond to contemporary conditions.

School District Organization Defined

Education is recognized as a function of the state. As a result, state legislatures, subject to constitutional provisions, have the authority to establish, maintain, and regulate schools. Thus the legal powers held by school districts are those delegated to them by the state. School districts are purely creatures of the state and as such have no inherent powers. They may be created or abolished and their powers may be increased or diminished at the will of the state.

The legal restructuring of school districts is referred to as school district reorganization. Such restructuring normally involves the combining of two or more school districts into a single larger administrative unit. However, the division of existing districts, such as large cities or counties, into smaller administrative units is also a type of school district reorganization. This type of reorganization, which creates additional school districts rather than abolishes existing ones, should not be confused with the internal modification of administrative organizations. Several large school systems have moved toward such internal modification or "decentralization". The units created by this process have no state delegated powers, therefore, this type of internal restructuring can logically be described as administrative procedure, rather than school district reorganization.

Still another form of school district reorganization is the creation of new, or the modification of existing intermediate or regional units with state delegated powers which are held jointly or shared with local school districts. The reorganization in this instance may represent a change in the physical boundaries of the unit or it may refer to a redistribution of powers between regional units and local school districts. An example of the latter is a transfer of taxing authority from local school districts to intermediate units to achieve a greater degree of equalization of tax effort. This form of reorganization may be combined with the division of large existing school districts into smaller units.[2] Such proposals have been advanced as partial solutions to the problems besetting urban schools.

The dimension and breadth of school district reorganization is truly enormous. Fitzwater[3] and other authors have identified all of the following types of school district reorganization that are occurring simultaneously in the United States:

1. Continued progress in eliminating nonoperating districts.
2. The requirement in an increasing number of states that all reorganized districts be unified (organized to operate both elementary and high schools); a related requirement is that territory of the state be in a district maintaining a high school.
3. The inclusion of more than one small high school district in a reorganized district.
4. The merging of previously established small reorganized units into enlarged reorganized units, in other words, reorganizing the reorganizations.

5. The merger of small or medium-sized city districts with the open country districts surrounding them.
6. Merging all or nearly all of the territory of a county into a single administrative unit.
7. The formation of large suburban districts adjoining major cities.
8. The merger of independent city districts and adjoining county school districts.
9. The formation of separately organized regional high school districts embracing the territory of several town (or township) school districts has been a developing trend in some New England states and in New Jersey.
10. The creation of intermediate or regional units with state delegated powers.
11. The division of large city districts into smaller units.
12. The gradual elimination of the office of county superintendent of schools.

Research Procedure

The procedure established and executed on this research project generated knowledge about the relationship of state financial aid programs and school district reorganization as outlined below:

1. Identified on the basis of a survey of the 48 contiguous state support provisions concerning school district reorganization and other provisions in the law which affect school district reorganization;
2. Utilized data derived from the above survey, selected a sample of states which presented a range of situations that may have had impact upon school district organization. Among the criteria for selection of states included in the sample are:
   a) Fiscal provisions for school district reorganization,
   b) Fiscal capacity of school districts within states,
   c) Sparsity and density of population,
   d) Number of school districts,
   e) Historical development of school district organization in the state,
   f) Geographical and topographical considerations, and
   g) Regional concepts of local control of education.
3. Obtained the following data in the selected sample of states.
   a) Level of expenditure per pupil from 1948-1968. Expenditures were categorized by fund type and by size of districts. Fund types include maintenance, capital outlay, and debt service.
   b) Level of state support for education in the districts. Aids applicable to the funds listed above were utilized. Correction aid for sparsity and premium aid for reorganization was of special interest.
   c) Nature of the aid distribution formulas legislated during the 20-year period and the years they were put into effect. The elements of the formulas were categorized by the fund types identified above.
   d) Local school tax rates in the districts for the 1967-68 year.
   e) Progress of school district reorganization including the number of districts of various types, by year, during the period.
   f) The statutes pertaining to intermediate districts were acquired. The amount of state and local funds received and distributed by the intermediate units were obtained.

g) The statues pertaining to reorganization were obtained. Also, related statutes which deter or encourage the consolidation of urban and suburban districts in metropolitan areas were examined. These statutes pertained to teacher retirement, tenure, and certification systems.

4. Analyzed the data collected to enable comparisons over a period of time among educational expenditure levels of state support, local property, tax rates, amount and type of incentive aids, incidence of factors in the state aid formula which deter school district reorganization, and changes in the number of school districts.
5. Formulated and tested hypotheses based on the following specific questions:
   a) To what extent has school district reorganization reduced variations in tax-paying ability and expenditure per pupil within states?
   b) Has school district reorganization introduced greater stability and equity into tax structures?
   c) At what level of state support for education does the greatest amount of school district reorganization tend to take place? (This level may be expressed in a ratio to per pupil expenditure.)
   d) What types of special incentive aids are associated with the greatest amount of school district reorganization?
   e) At what support levels must incentive aids operate in order to yield the greatest amount of reorganization activity among local districts?
   f) What factors in the state aid distribution system retard school district reorganization?
   g) What factors in state aid distribution plans discourage the consolidation of central city and suburban school districts?
   h) What other legal provisions, e.g., procedural requirements for school district reorganization, tend to circumvent fiscal incentives?
   i) How do state aid systems relate to the trend toward decentralization of policy making in large cities?
   j) What is the potential for utilizing intermediate or regional units to collect and distribute local taxes?

Scope and Description of Part I

Patterns of School District Organization is the product of the research activities of this special project of the National Educational Finance Project. It provides the general data base to support the analyses and hypotheses testing which is reported in Part II of the project report.

Chapter I, "Introduction" consists of the background and purpose of the study, defines school district organization in general operational terms, describes the research design utilized in the conduct of the study, and describes the content of the two volume project report.

A state-by-state description of the "Organization for Local School Districts" is presented in Chapter II. It includes a historical summary and interpretation of the statutory provisions for school district reorganization for each state. Quantitative data on patterns of local school districts are included for the periods of 1948-1968.

Chapter III, "Profiles of Regional and Intermediate Units", provides a definition of intermediate units and describes existing units in the 33 states where such units meet the criteria established. The state-by-state review of intermediate units relates information on number, type, size, expenditures, legal (statutory) basis, levy authority, state aids, and relationship to constituent school districts. Also discussed is the nature of the program and services provided by the intermediate unit.

Chapter IV, "State Aids for Local Districts", presents specific information, state-by-state, concerning the various aspects of the state aid distribution pattern. State aids are tabulated by purpose and title for each state and are summarized by type of aids for the periods 1949-50, 1953-54, 1957-58, 1966-67, and 1968-69. Data for each state is presented in a common format emphasizing categories of aid; i.e., general purpose flat-grant, general purpose equalizing-grant, special purpose flat-grant, and special purpose equalizing-grant. A summarization of trends in the level of state support for the period of 1948-68 is included.

The Appendices A-E provide additional statistical data on each state. Basic statistical profiles for each state provide comprehensive information on population (total and pupil), per pupil expenditures, number of school districts by type and size, and sources of school revenues (federal, state, local). The contents of Appendix E provide a data array in the aforementioned categories for the years 1948, 1952, 1956, 1960, 1964, and 1968. Additional appendices provide lists of cooperating states and National Educational Finance Project personnel, a listing of state education agency contact personnel for this project, a glossary of relevant definitions, and a description of the special project staff.

Summary

Information derived from the research reported in this report (Part I) enabled project staff to select a sample of states for more extensive data collection and analysis. Information available in the two-volume report of this project is designed to provide a framework which will enable professional educators to advise legislators on policy considerations that will help influence school district reorganization. With knowledge of this type, reorganization could hopefully be effected by managing economic factors in a way that can result in greater equalization of educational opportunity as well as more efficient utilization of score resources.

Footnotes

[1] Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483, 493 (1954).

[2] For a treatise on this topic see Clifford P. Hooker and Van D. Mueller, Equal Treatment to Equals--A New Structure for Public Schools in the Kansas City and St. Louis Metropolitan Areas, A Report to the Missouri School District Reorganization Commission, June 1969.

[3] C. O. Fitzwater, State School System Development (Denver: Education Commission of States, 1968) pp. 20-21.

CHAPTER II

ORGANIZING FOR LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The establishment of effective local districts for administering public schools has been traditionally recognized as having a great influence on the educational opportunities of children and youth. The scope and quality of their public school opportunities are to a great extent dependent on an adequate local school district structure.

In its more general usage, the term school district refers to a local unit of government, possessing quasi-corporate powers, and established or empowered by state law to conduct and administer a public school or a system of public schools. This district is usually controlled by a board of education, has local taxing power, and authority to make contracts. There are various types of school districts at the local level including common, city, independent, consolidated, separate high school, union, community, town, township, and county unit districts.[1]

With America's long established tradition of local control over education, the problem of school district reorganization is very complex. Although it is often viewed as a local function, education is a responsibility of the state. Local school districts derive their existence, form, and powers from the state. The responsibility for improving school district organization lies with the state legislatures which have the power to create, destroy, or alter school districts. This concept is fundemental to understanding the problem of organizing and reorganizing local school districts to perform effectively and efficiently the task of educating the nation's school age population.

This section deals with the legal structure that has been established in each state for the organization of local school districts. The range of interest for this study has been the twenty years of 1948-68 but in some instances, pertinent legislation has been cited outside of this time period where the authors felt such legislation had relevance for the discussion. Special emphasis in this section has been placed on legislation leading to school district reorganization. A rather legalistic definition of school district reorganization has been utilized to form a conceptual framework for developing this chapter:

> The act of legally changing the designation of a school district, changing its geographic area, or incorporating a part or all of a school district with an adjoining district is termed school district reorganization.[2]

An effort has also been made to specifically draw attention to that type of legislation that has provided financial incentives for reorganization.

A number of resources were utilized in gathering the information in this section. An initial questionnaire was sent out to contact people within the various state departments of education requesting information as to whether or not their state had attempted to encourage school district reorganization

by means of enticement with general or special state aid payments. Utilizing this information and the research done on legislation, pertaining to school district reorganization by a school law class at the University of Minnesota, a profile of legislation was developed for each state. This profile, along with an additional questionnaire asking for more specific information, was then sent to the state contact people for corrections and additions. Utilizing the corrected profiles and additional information, the project staff developed the following summaries for each state concerning the basic legislation dealing with school district organization.

As with any study of this nature, limitations in the information may exist. Where legislation pertaining to school district reorganization was not uncovered by the research team and this deficiency was not noted or corrected by the state contact people, it simply has not found its way into the study. Although the project staff made every effort to clarify the available information through extensive research and direct contact with state department personnel, the need for personal interpretation still existed in certain instances and should be appropriately recognized.

Organization for Local School Districts

Alabama

In 1948 Alabama had 108 school districts in the state. By the fall of 1968 this number had grown to 120, or an increase of 12.

Provisions for the consolidation of schools can be found as early as 1927 in the Code of Alabama 1958, Recompiled, Volume 12, Title 52. Under those early provisions the responsibility for the administration and supervision of all public schools in the state was vested in county boards of education under the direction of the state board of education. County superintendents were authorized to recommend the consolidation of schools within the county and with city boards of education under prescribed conditions.

In 1957 local boards of education were authorized to close any schools within their jurisdiction if the presence of such schools threatened the tranquility of the school district, county or community (Code of Alabama, Recompiled, 1958, Volume 12, Title 52, Section 61).

An added feature of the Alabama plan for organization of schools can be found in the Independent School District Act of 1959 (Code of Alabama, Recompiled, 1967, Cumulative Supplement to Volume 12, Title 52, Sections 179, 197). This act provides the legal basis for the organization of a school system within the prescribed basic county board system, but separate and apart from any legal upper echelon school authority; i.e., local district, county board, or state board of education.

In 1964 the transportation of pupils was tied to consolidation and became a provision thereof.

There has been little change in school district organization in Alabama since 1927. Since the Independent School Act of 1959, five new districts have been added.

Arizona

There were 342 school districts in Arizona in 1948. Since that time 51 districts have been eliminated leaving this total in the fall of 1968 at 297.

From 1948-1968 there seems to have been no legislative enactments that have had a major effect on school district organization.

The district is the unit for school administration in Arizona. Districts may be consolidated upon a majority vote of the people in the districts. Common school districts close up when fewer than eight pupils of school age attend school for three months during any school year and the county superintendent recommends it to the board of supervisors.

The state law provides for high school districts, union high school districts, and county high school districts. Any school district having an average daily attendance of 200 or more pupils and an assessed valuation of not less than $2,000,000 may, by a majority vote of the qualified school electors of the district, establish and maintain a high school. Such a district then becomes a high school district. Two or more adjoining school districts having a joint average daily attendance of not less than 200 pupils may unite for high school purposes. They then form a union high school district. In any county having an assessed valuation of not more than $8,000,000 wherein no high school has been established the board of county supervisors may in their discretion, or upon petition signed by 15 percent of the registered voters of the county, call an election to determine whether or not a county union high school shall be established. If the vote is favorable the county becomes a county high school district. District high schools and union high schools may be later established in the county high school district.

Arkansas

The major thrust toward school district organization occurred in Arkansas between 1944 and 1951. In 1944, Arkansas had 2,451 school districts whereas the 1951 total was down to 425. This last figure has gradually leveled off to a 1968 total of 390.

In 1943, Act 271, Section 1, was passed by the Arkansas legislature to cure some of the environmental defects in school districts as they existed then. Actually, this act seemed to clarify some questions being raised concerning the formation, consolidation, change of boundary lines, and other alteration of school districts by the action of county boards of education or the county court.

In 1947 the legislature amended the state's statute (Section 11488 of Pope's Digest, Acts of Arkansas) to include provisions for dissolution and annexation of school districts within the county when an election is held.

"The county board of education may dissolve any school district and annex the territory thereof to any district within the county when petitioned to do so by a majority of the qualified electors of the district to be dissolved, or by an election held in the district to be dissolved where a majority of the votes cast are in favor of the dissolution and annexation, and upon the consent of the board of directors of the district to which the territory is to be annexed."

By 1949, additional enactments created a situation in which county boards of education were vested by law with a sound discretion in the determination of the matters necessary to the formation or consolidation of school districts. Their decision was subject to review only when it appeared that such orders were arbitrary or unreasonable.

In 1950, under an Initiated Act (Arkansas Statute 80-426 titled "County School District Covering Former Small Districts") the Arkansas State Legislature provided for the creation in each county of a united school district composed of all school districts within the county having less than 350 students. The county board of education was given the power to annex a portion of the united district to a larger district only with the consent of such larger district, but did not have to give notice or obtain the consent of patrons of the united district as a prerequisite to such an annexation order by the board.

The 1969 General Assembly passed two provisions having direct implications for school district reorganization in Arkansas. Act 229 of 1969, "The Quality Education Act", mandates that all public elementary and secondary schools with a state department of education rating less than "A", shall be eliminated not later than June 1, 1979. The county board of education has the power to abolish such districts and annex them to a receiving district which is mandated to accept them. Act 449 of 1969 provided for a guaranteed allocation and financial incentive for reorganization. School districts choosing to consolidate shall receive no less state financial aid under this Act per child in average daily attendance in a given year than was received by that district in Arkansas Foundation Program Aid or State Financial Aid per child in average daily attendance the previous year. In addition, such districts shall receive in each school year an amount for each child in average daily attendance equal to the average increase per child in average daily attendance in Arkansas Foundation Program Aid over th previous year's state aid.

California

The 1945 Act titled "Optional Reorganization of School Districts By Electors" provided a practical means, for the first time in the state's history, for forming unified districts. It can be pinpointed as a significant piece of legislation for a change in the number of school districts in 1945-46 of 2,568 to a 1954-55 total of 1,934, a reduction of almost one-fourth. A State Commission on School Districts, Regional Planning Commissions and Local Survey committees were all established to formulate plans and recommendations for unification or other reorganization of school districts.

When territory was divided to form more than one unified district, the bond obligation remained with the territory that incurred the debt. The new district could assume the bond debt of the former district only by a bond assumption election. Presently in California, if a district having bonded indebtedness is formed into two or more unified districts, the territory of the original district retains liability for the debt, but the resulting districts shall pay an amount toward bond redemption equal to the proportionate value of the property acquired.

A series of amendments in 1947 also aided reorganization by removing a provision requiring a favorable majority to vote in each component district for inclusion in a unified district; enlargement of local survey committees while still giving them more of a vote in determining reorganization; and a provision allowing local survey committees to recommend that the proposed reorganized districts assume all or part of the outstanding bonded indebtedness of component districts (to be based on a two-thirds vote in each component district).

In 1949 another series of amendments were added to the 1945 statute. The most important seems to be the dissolvement of the 1945 State Commission with

the corresponding transfer of its functions to the State Board of Education. The State Department of Education was assigned responsibility for providing the State Board with necessary professional and clerical help for carrying on the unification program. Another significant amendment was the mandatory establishment of a school district reorganization committee in every county except San Francisco.

To a certain extent a 1936 California law requiring that whenever the boundaries of separately organized elementary and high school districts are made coterminous they automatically become a unified school district, may be having a small effect in the reduction of number of districts.

The 1951 Education Code of California continued basic reorganization provisions relating to annexation, changing boundaries and uniting districts. It did provide for an optional reorganization plan and also set forth certain basic changes in the Equalization Aid and Transportation Aid programs.

Statutes of 1959 added a new chapter in which county committees were required to prepare a master plan for the school district organization of their counties. The date for submission was set for September 15, 1963. Elections were required to be held within two years after State Board of Education approval. This was the extent to which the Legislature was willing to mandate reorganization.

Colorado

In 1944 Colorado had 1,920 school districts. The state's first real district reorganization program was started in 1949. During the first two years 37 new districts were established, but the total number in the state was reduced by more than a fourth. Amendments to the legislation were enacted in 1951, which severely restricted continued progress. The first series of reorganization legislation expired July 1, 1954. In 1957 and 1965 legislation patterned after the 1949 statute was passed. Colorado has dropped from a total of 1,920 districts in 1944 to a 1966 total of 184. There has been no financial entice-ment to encourage reorganization.

Session Laws of Colorado, 1949, Chapter 224, provided the first significant legislation for reorganization in the state. It set up county committees to help the State Commissioner in developing reorganization plans. There was a special assistant to the Commissioner appointed to work in this area. The Commissioner was given the power to approve county plans, and no reorganization could be brought to a vote without his approval. He was also required to prepare and submit to the next legislature a plan for reorganizing all areas of the state not included in reorganized districts. A procedure for drawing up a proposal, having it then approved by the Commissioner, and finally bringing it to a local vote was also adopted.

Reorganization activity reached its peak in 1950. Twenty-nine reorganization elections out of thirty-eight were passed on favorably by the voters. The effect of state school finance programs are difficult to gauge. In one case a district enrolling approximately 230 pupils lost over $3,000 the first year so there may have been some proposals failing because the state financial provisions were not favorable to enlarged districts.

By 1951 opposition to reorganization seemed to become far more organized and active. During the 1951 legislative session, changes were made in the Reorganization Act of 1949 which severely restricted the operation of the reorganization program. Four changes of major significance were:

1. Repeal of the provision allowing for a special assistant to the Commissioner to help in conducting the reorganization program.
2. Repeal of the provision that a reorganization plan could not be brought to a vote until approved by the State Commissioner.
3. Approval of a reorganization by a majority of the total votes cast in the area was changed so that only those districts having a favorable majority vote could be included in a reorganized unit.
4. County committees were to function until completion of reorganization within their counties but not later than July 1, 1954.

The "District Organization Act of 1957", 123-25-2, seems to embody many features of the 1949 act with its main emphasis being on the equalization of the benefits and burdens of education throughout the states, counties, and communities. An increase in reorganizational activity did follow this act with the number of districts dropping from 947 in 1957 to 522 in 1959.

In 1963 the School District Reorganization Act was passed. The significant feature that made this legislation differ from the 1957 law was that it embodies a feature providing for the assumption of bonded indebtedness. A leveling feature in this legislation may be restricting voluntary reorganization.

The 1964 legislature amended the 1957 legislation even further. H.B. 1009 provided in effect that County High School Districts and their component elementary districts should cease to exist on February 1, 1965 and that, if the combined enrollments of such districts were less than 1,500, their areas were to be annexed to the adjacent district or districts containing enrollments of more than 1,500. The number of school districts was reduced from 205 to 184 during 1965.

Connecticut

In 1949 the Connecticut legislature passed Statute 10-240. Basically it stated that each town was to maintain the control of all the public schools within its limits and for this purpose was to be a school district with all the powers and purposes thereof.

For twenty years Connecticut has had little change in the number of school districts (1948 - 173 districts, 1969 - 174 districts).

In 1967 the legislature enacted provisions including some financial enticements that may have resulted in an increase in four regionalized districts (k-12) in the past two years.

Laws of Education, 1967, Sec. 10-53, states:

> All provisions of the general statutes relating to public education, including those providing state grants in aid, shall apply to each town belonging to a regional school district, provided if the board of education of any regional school district provides transportation to a regional school, such district shall be reimbursed by the state as provided in section 10-54, and providing

> any town which is a member of a regional school district furnishing an educational program including Kindergarten through grade twelve shall receive each year in addition to the amount of state aid under section 10-262 ten percent of said amount.

Connecticut Laws of Education, 1967, Sections 10-282 to 10-288 provide criteria establishing the eligibility of regional school districts for state school building grants. In the case of a school building project in a regional school district providing accommodations for pupils in kindergarten through grade twelve for all participating towns, eighty percent of the necessary project cost, as determined by the state board of education, will be granted.

Delaware

Reorganization legislation in Delaware dates back to 1919 when school law, created "special school districts" in the urban areas, requiring them to maintain schools for elementary and high school pupils. All other school districts, usually small and in rural areas, were designated as "state board districts" in 1921. In addition to the special and state board districts the Legislature created two area high school districts, each comprising several elementary districts, and one area vocational school district for each of three counties.

The school district reorganization question was raised from time to time over the years by the state superintendents in their annual reports. In 1946, a school survey recommended redistricting and this prompted the first comprehensive study and report on reorganization since 1921. This report, issued in 1951, recommended that 12 administrative units replace the existent 117 districts. Although the legislature did not adopt the report in terms of legislation, a gradual decline in number of districts was initiated.

In 1965, the Governor's Committee on Education inaugurated another study, with considerable emphasis on reorganization. In its report it recommended a reduction from the existing 51 school districts to 25 (including vocational districts). This report provided major impetus for the passage by the legislature in 1968 of major reorganization legislation. This act, H. B. 438, as amended by H. A. No. 2, literally replaced the codes dealing with school consolidation.

The present law has interesting implications for school district reorganization. Chapter 10, subchapter 1, 1004, requires the state board of education to prepare plans of reorganization for each school district by October 24, 1968. These plans were to be based on the following type of criteria: topography, pupil population, community characteristics, transportation of pupils, existing school facilities, existing school districts, potential population changes and the capability of providing a comprehensive program of efficient and effective education.

The plan of reorganization of school districts prepared by the state board of education was to be submitted to the school districts not more than 10 days after its preparation. Any district considering itself aggrieved could appeal on or before December 1, 1968. The state board would then provide a hearing for such district during the period December 1, 1968 through January 31, 1969.

On or before March 1, 1969, the state board of education shall meet and adopt a final plan of reorganization of school districts which it seems wise.

Plans to be adopted have to meet the following requirements: (1004, C).

(1) Each proposed school district shall offer a complete instructional program grades one through twelve.

(2) Each proposed school district including more than one component former school district shall have a pupil enrollment of not less than 1900 nor more than 12,000 in grades one through twelve.

(3) Each proposed school district which is composed of more than one existing school district shall be composed of only whole existing school districts except as herein defined and only to the extent that those whole existing school districts are contiguous as reorganized. No existing school district shall be subdivided in order to form any proposed school district except a superimposed high school district, which may be subdivided.

(4) The proposed school district for the city of Wilmington shall be the city of Wilmington with the territory within its limits.

(5) In addition to other proposed school districts there shall be a number of proposed school districts for vocational-technical centers, or schools which shall be superimposed upon proposed school districts which shall not overlap one another, and which taken together shall include the entire geographical area of the state. Requirements (1) and (2) of this subsection shall not apply with respect to proposed school districts for vocational-technical centers, or schools which districts shall contain such instructional programs, numbers of grades, and pupil enrollments which, as determined by the state board of education subject to section 202 and 207 of this title, are in the best educational interests of the proposed vocational-technical school districts.

(6) Each proposed school district shall have a name designated by the state board of education after consultation with the school board of the school district or districts composing the proposed school district.

(7) Any one-to-twelve existing school district, as constituted March 15, 1968, shall not be required by the state board of education to consolidate with any other one-to-twelve existing school district which comprises over 100 square miles and has a pupil enrollment of more than 1900 in grades one through twelve. Any such school district shall be a reorganized school district for the purpose of this Act.

(8) Any existing school district which operates cooperatively with a school district from another state shall continue to do so as long as a result of the existing school districts' unique positions. Any such school district shall be a reorganized school district for the purpose of this act.

On July 1, 1969, all proposed school districts contained in the plan as adopted by the state board of education were constituted and known as reorganized school districts.

Section (1006.a) provides that except as otherwise provided in this section, all real and personal property of a former school district or districts composing any reorganized school district constituted and established pursuant to sections 1004 and 1005 of this chapter shall become the property of and vested in such reorganized school district; and all indebtedness and obligations of a component former school district shall become the indebtedness and obligations of such reorganized school district. All rights of creditors against any component former school district or districts shall be preserved against the reorganized school district. All indebtedness and obligations owed to a component former school district, and all indebtedness, obligations, and taxes owing to or for the accounts of the component former school district or districts, uncollected in the component former school district or districts, and all monies deposited to

or for the account or accounts of component former school districts shall be paid to or for, as the case may be, the account or accounts of the reorganized school district.

Section 1027, of the law enables the state board of education to consolidate two or more reorganized school districts, which are contiguous when in their judgement it is practicable and desirable.

Florida

The 1885 constitution for Florida, sections 1-18 inclusive, deals extensively and prescriptively with education. It established a county school district trustee system which, through a 1947 amendment, was modified to create a county board organization (F.S.A., Sec. 228.15).

The constitution of 1968, Article IX, concerns itself with education and modifies the above format by excluding reference to the district school trustees. Basically it provides that each county shall constitute a school district, provided two or more contiguous counties, upon vote of the electors of each county pursuant to law, may be combined into one school district. In each school district there shall be a school board composed of five or more members chosen by vote of the electors for appropriately staggered terms of four years, as provided by law.

The school board shall operate, control and supervise all free public schools within the school district and determine the rate of school district taxes within the limits prescribed herein. Two or more school districts may operate and finance joint educational programs. In addition, Chapter 69-300, Laws of Florida, repeals all statutory references to district trustees.

All school districts in all territory not included in school districts in each county of the state shall be consolidated in each county into one school district.

Florida has 67 school districts which correspond to the number of counties in the state, although there is a great difference in the pupil population of these districts.

Georgia

In 1919 legislation was passed establishing county districts. In 1946 (CGA 32-915) county boards of education were given the right to consolidate two or more schools into one school in their county if, in their opinion, the welfare of the schools and the best interest of the pupils required it.

In 1951 the legislature provided that the state could withhold capital outlay allotments from school districts the state department felt should consolidate (CGA 32-1401A-33).

In 1966 Georgia had 195 school districts in the state whereas in 1944 they had 223. Although little change has come about in terms of the number of school districts, over 6,000 schools have been eliminated through consolidation from 1948-66.

Idaho

In 1943-44 Idaho had 1,300 school districts. By 1951-52 this number had been reduced to 270 and by the fall of 1969 the number of school districts in Idaho was 115.

The state of Idaho began a reorganization program in 1947 with what was known as the Peabody survey. This resulted in 1947 legislation which was so successful in promoting reorganization, that by 1949 over 80% of the area of the state was in reorganized districts. (This legislation is basically found in Laws of 1947, Chapter 111.)

Among the provisions was a classification of school districts. All reorganized districts had to belong to one of the three following classes:

Class A - assessed valuation of $2,000,000 or more and employ 25 or more teachers; must provide education for grades 1-12 inclusive; may provide for kindergarten.

Class B - newly organized unified school district from two or more presently organized districts into a community school district. Shall include central service area, the high school of at least 100 in grades 9-12, education in all grades 1-12. May offer kindergarten.

Class C - all other newly organized school districts which are under the direct administration of the county school administration. Education grades 1-8.

A state committee was to be appointed with the following functions: (1) to employ a director and necessary personnel with major concern for school district reorganization; (2) appoint county committees in any county where none had been established, or where county committees had failed to exercise their responsibility; (3) assist the county committee in carrying on their work; (4) approval of reorganization proposals, including recommendations for disposition of assets and liabilities submitted by county committees; (5) make a progress report, together with recommendations for legislation, to each session of the legislature. County committees were appointed to prepare plans for reorganizing districts and unorganized territory of the county into the three classes created by the legislation. Existing district boundary lines could be disregarded in preparing plans for reorganized districts. In preparing reorganization plans consideration was to be given to the educational and financial needs of the local communities with the emphasis on equalizing educational opportunities of pupils. The plan for a proposed new district had to include terms for the adjustment of assets and liabilities of the component districts. Public hearings had to be held unless the plan was prepared by a school board of a district maintaining a 4-year high school with an ADA of 100 or more pupils or by school boards of 2 or more adjacent districts in the service area of such a high school and submitted to the county committee for its approval. Within 10 days after receipt of a reorganization proposal approved by the state committee the board of county commissioners was required to call a special election for voter approval of the plan. If by July 1, 1949 or a later date approved by the state committee, there remained any county territory not in a reorganized district, either because no plans had been developed or because plans had been rejected by the voters, the county committee was required to organize all such territory into one or more reorganized districts. This procedure did not require approval by the voters. The 1949 legislature extended the above date to July 1, 1951. In 1951 the legislature passed an amendment repealing the provision requiring mandatory reorganization without a vote, for all unreorganized territory after 1951. The same

legislature passed an amendment providing a means whereby two-thirds of the qualified electors in any area of a reorganized district could petition the state board to separate and become part of an adjoining district.

1961 proved to be a significant year for reorganization in Idaho. All areas of the state were to be reorganized by June 30, 1961. County boards were abolished in reorganized counties and those remaining in counties not completely reorganized were to be financed by taxes levied only on the unreorganized portions of the county. The office of County Superintendent was also to be abolished.

The 1963 legislature provided that 10 or more school district electors residing in an area of not less than 10 square miles within which there was no schoolhouse or facility necessary for the operation of a school district may petition in writing proposing the annexation of the area to another and contiguous district. Another enactment dealt with lapsed districts. If the state board of education shall find any district has not operated its school for a period of one school year, or in which the average daily attendance during each term of not less than seven months in the two school years last past less than five pupils, or for a period of not less than one year last past has had an insufficient number of members on its board of trustees lawfully to conduct the business of the district, the state board of education shall enter its order declaring any said district to be lapsed and which district shall lapse as of the first day of July next following the date of said order. It also made it possible for the board of trustees of two or more contiguous school districts to submit to the state board of education a plan for the consolidation of their districts into a single new district.

Illinois

In 1943-44 Illinois had 11,998 school districts, over 9,700 of which were one teacher districts. The school code of 1945 provided for a State Commission and county committees to conduct studies and prepare organization plans. Two years later the community-unit district law was enacted to provide a practical way for establishing 12-grade districts. By 1951-52, the total number of school districts had dropped to 3,413.

The 1947 community-unit school district law provided that any compact and contiguous territory, no part of which was included within any community-unit school district, might be organized into a new 12-grade district, providing the territory concerned had a population of not less than 2,000 persons and an assessed valuation of not less than $6 million. Existing school district boundaries, as well as the boundaries of any other local government unit, could be disregarded in forming such units. Most of the reorganization took place between the effective date of the community-unit law (late July, 1947) and October 1949. During that period, over 6,000 school districts were eliminated.

Legislative policy has been to leave resident voters the settlement of questions concerning school district reorganization but have moved to block the formation of more small districts by denying petitions of organization if the resulting district will have any non-high school territory or if after any boundary changes a district would fall below the population and valuation standards of 2,000 persons or $6 million.

An incentive for reorganization has resulted from the denial of state aid to very small school districts. Districts with an ADA of less than 60 for grades 9-12, must obtain special approval of the county and state superintendent

of schools to participate. No school district may receive more than $400 per ADA if it is substandard. (H.B. 1798, 1967).

The total number of school districts in the fall of 1968 was 1,279.

Indiana

In 1948 there were approximately 1,200 school districts in the state of Indiana. By July 1, 1969 this number had been reduced to only 289. More than 90 percent of the public school pupils reside in school corporations which have been reorganized. The major portion of this reduction has taken place between the years 1959 and 1969, as in 1957-58 there were still over 1,000 districts in the state.

Although reorganization legislation dates back to 1852 in Indiana, the first having any real impact of a contemporary nature developed during the decade of the 1950's. The School Survey Commission was created by House Concurrent Resolution 18, approved in March 1951. It provided for a bipartisan commission of eight members to do extensive research into the areas of school finance and school district reorganization. The report of this commission, entitled, Report of the Indiana State School Survey Commission to the Governor of Indiana (1952) made two major recommendations. With respect to housing, it was proposed that the state should participate in financing public school buildings in local school administrative units. In regard to school reorganization the commission encouraged the General Assembly to create a bipartisan state commission on school reorganization empowered to establish local committees to work out suggestions for reorganization and to provide technical assistance to these committees.

The 1955 Metropolitan School Consolidation Law did encourage some reorganization. In 1957 a major school reorganization bill was introduced but failed to pass the House after being acted upon favorably by the Senate. Nine minor measures were passed, mostly dealing with specific localities or situations.

It was in 1959 that the General Assembly passed the most significant legislation pertaining to school district reorganization. The law, entitled the School Corporation Reorganization Law, was a bipartisan measure setting up the legal machinery to enable citizens in each of the counties to study their own school organization needs and to institute changes if they believe improvement is needed. Studies of school corporation organization were required by law, but the law did not require any changes if a majority of the local citizens did not want them.

The law provided for a State Reorganization Commission with the following specific duties:

1. To establish minimum educational standards against which to evaluate plans submitted by county committees.
2. To review plans submitted to it by county committees and either approve the plans or recommend changes to conform to minimum educational standards.
3. To conduct hearings in the local county on the county committee plan before it has received the approval or disapproval of the State Commission.
4. To assist county committees in their analysis of local school organizations and the formulation of plans for reorganization.

5. To report to the General Assembly on the operation of the School Corporation Reorganization law, the progress that has been made in its operation, and recommendations for improvement.

The commission could recommend and urge achievement of minimum standards for the counties education system, but it could not force local residents to accept what they did not want. The minimum standard policies set forth by the commission were:

1. Any county reorganization plan must first have the approval of the county committee before it will be approved by the State Commission.
2. Each proposed reorganized school corporation must meet the following minimums for pupil population and wealth:
   (a) A total of 1,000 resident average daily attendance grades 1-12, of all the schools of the corporation combined.
   (b) Not less than $5,000 adjusted assessed valuation per resident pupil in average daily attendance.

   NOTE: The above minimum standards, shall be in effect unless the county committee has received a written order from the State School Reorganization Commission stating that for a specified geographical area in the county, meeting such standards is not feasible.
3. County plans must include all of the area within the county. Such plans may provide for one or more school corporations, but the entire county must be considered in the proposal.
4. Each proposed reorganized school corporation must provide the base for an efficient and adequate educational program for all the pupils in grades 1-12.

County Reorganization Committees were established to study the present organization of school corporations and develop a plan for their most efficient administration. The committee could decide that the county had the kind of school organization in existence that was already satisfactory. A plan could not go into effect until it was approved by a majority of the voters in the areas affected.

The County Committee was required to study the present organization of the various school corporations within the county, including:

1. The adequacy of the education program
2. The number of pupils attending school and the population of each school corporation
3. The assessed taxable valuation of the school corporation
4. The per pupil assessed valuation for each school corporation
5. Geographical and economic characteristics of the county
6. Other pertinent facts about the county.

The committee was called upon to include in its plan:

1. The boundaries of the school corporations
2. The administration of the corporations. If a new corporation is recommended the committee is to set forth:
   (a) the number of school board members. (Either 3, 5, or 7).

(b) the manner in which the school board members are to be elected or appointed.
(c) limitations on residence of school board members
(d) the term of office and other qualifications required of the members of the board of school trustees, and
(e) the name of the school corporation.

Public hearings were to be held by the committee throughout the county to discuss the reorganization plan and opportunity was given the local residents to make suggestions. The law required the committee to consider suggestions made at these hearings and gave the committee authority to make revisions or modifications in the plan if necessary.

As part of the same legislation, restrictions were placed on new building construction. Effective the date of the legislation (March 12, 1959) no new school construction was to be permitted by a school corporation having an enrollment of pupils to be housed therein equivalent to less than four classroom units for grades nine through twelve.

The 1959 School Corporation Reorganization Act was amended by the 1961, 1963, and 1965 General Assemblies. The revisions in the 1959 Act have been minor. It is possible to make substantial changes in territorial boundaries through annexation by mutual consent. Chapter 439, Acts of 1965, amended the School Corporation Annexation Act of 1963, to permit school board representation for the annexed area.

Iowa

Iowa had 4,856 school districts in 1943-44 and was experiencing no activity related to school district reorganization. In 1945 legislation was enacted requiring county boards of education to conduct studies and promote district reorganization.

In a 1947 act (Section 273.2) a county school system became a part of the Iowa public school system. In the event an independent or consolidated school district wanted to be part of the county system, a majority of the voters in the district could approve the transfer.

In 1953 sweeping legislative changes were made. All the old legal provisions which had accumulated over the years for affecting school district boundaries were repealed and changes in the reorganization law were extensive.

In 1957 the legislature enacted significant reorganization legislation. Chapter 275, Reorganization of School Districts, required all county boards of education to initiate surveys and studies for the purpose of promoting reorganization. These studies were to be completed by July 1, 1958 and were to concern themselves with how to better insure equal educational opportunity through the reorganization of school districts.

In 1965 this was expanded upon by the Sixty-first Legislature to declare that all areas of the state should be in districts maintaing twelve grades by July 1, 1966. Failure of the districts to attach themselves to such a district would result in having the county board of education do this for them.

The setting of July 1, 1966 as a deadline has had a critical impact on reorganization in Iowa as is evidenced in a decline from 984 school districts in 1965-66 to a total of 474 in May of 1968. 455 of these 474 districts are unified in K-12 districts.

Kansas

In 1945 school district reorganization legislation was enacted creating county committees empowered to reorganize school districts without a vote of the local people concerned. In two years over 2,600 school districts were eliminated. The major provisions included: (1) A division of school district reorganization was created in the State Department of Public Instruction which was to advise and counsel with county reorganization committees; (2) County Committees were designated and given the responsibility of making comprehensive studies and developing reorganization plans; (3) These plans could be adopted and ordered put into effect by county committees without a vote of the people, but only after public hearings were held. A 1947 amendment gave the people a voice in who the county committee members would be. Incidently, as part of the state aid program under the 1945 legislation, schools enrolling less than 10 pupils were allowed no state aid. In June of 1947 the Kansas Supreme Court held both the 1945 and 1947 acts unconstitutional on the grounds that they constituted an improper delegation of legislative power to county communities. The 1951 legislature passed an act recodifying existing laws relating to consolidation and other boundary changes of common school districts. It required that common school districts which had not maintained a school for three years were to be discontinued and their territory attached to operating districts by July 1, 1951. (Three hundred and thirty-six non-operating districts were eliminated in 1951 by annexing their territory to operating units.)

In 1961 new legislation was enacted embodying many of the features of the 1945 act. This too was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court as an extension of the legislative power to the State Superintendent of Instruction.

In 1963 K.S.A. 72-6734 was enacted and contains the basic provisions concerning reorganization now found in Kansas. The intent of the act is to equalize the benefits and burdens of education throughout the state. All lands and districts must be organized into K-12 systems (kindergarten is optional). The entire state was divided into 106 planning units. The planning unit was to formulate a plan for the consolidation of school districts into units having programs 1-12. Each school district was to contain a minimum of 400 students unless an exception was made by the State Education Department. When the plan was unconditionally approved by the State Superintendent, elections were to be held in the areas affected. A plan failing in the election would be returned to the planning committee.

The 1963 Legislature (1963 SB# 377) also provided the first unification act that encouraged reorganization. A district petitioning to unify could include territory outside its district boundaries. The State Superintendent was required to attach non-high school territory to unified districts. A moratorium was placed on building construction in non-unified districts. Approval of the State Superintendent was required. Territory could not be transferred from a unified district to a non-unified district.

In 1944 Kansas had 6,573 school districts. By the fall of 1968 this number had decreased to 330.

Kentucky

In 1908 Kentucky completely remodeled their high school system. The new plan adopted at that time called for a modified county-city organizational system. In the 1930's legislation was passed (K.R.S. 160-020) further defining an independent school district. It also stated that no independent district other than a city of the first five classes shall continue to operate when its

school census enumeration of white children fell below 200 pupils. By 1943, 257 school districts existed compared to 384 in 1932.

1948 legislation (K.R.S. 160.041) outlined provisions for the merger of an independent district with a county district based on an appeal from the independent board to the county board. If this appeal failed, it could be submitted to the State Board of Education.

Except for the definite establishment of the county system in 1908, reorganization legislation in Kentucky has been permissive. There were 200 school districts in 1965-66, 92 of these being independent districts. By the fall of 1968 this number had been reduced to 195.

Louisiana

There are sixty-four parish (county) and two city school systems in Louisiana. As Louisiana has operated under this basic format for over twenty years, there has been no significant legislation passed that has had an impact on school district reorganization during the period of this study.

It is of interest to note that although the number of school districts has remained constant over this time, there has been a reduction in the total number of schools operating from 2,840 in 1948 to 1,885 in 1968 according to statistics produced by the United States Office of Education.

Maine

In 1944 Maine had five hundred school districts. By the fall of 1968 this number had been reduced to three hundred and seven. During this time permissive reorganization legislation was passed as well as legislation providing certain financial incentives to those districts willing to reorganize.

In 1947 a significant act known as the Community School District Act was passed, allowing towns to join together to operate a secondary school. (1947, Ch. 357, Sess. 92A-92K.) There were no financial incentives or inducements other than that two or more towns might have a better secondary school if they joined together.

In 1954 (Title 44, Sub. 77) legislation was passed directing the commissioner and State Board of Education to adjust the grouping of Supervisory Unions within the state into districts containing 35-75 teachers. The commissioner was given authority to adjust disbursements so that there was no loss in state support as a result of this reorganization. School committees in the affected units were involved in the planning of reorganized units.

The 1957 legislation encouraged developments of sufficient size to provide equal opportunity and better tax rates (Title 364, Sub. 1-B, Title 443, Sub. 2). The State Board of Education was to develop a state plan for the creation of efficient school administrative districts and for approving applications for organizing school administrative districts. One of their responsibilities was to evaluate the impact of consolidation on valuation per pupil in the larger district and make definite recommendations with respect to an eventual uniform minimum tax rate toward the support of a foundation program of education when these larger districts have been appropriately established throughout the state. The basic criteria for new school administrative districts were: a) three hundred pupils, grades 9-12; b) any 9-12 program operating on April 1, 1957 that can join with another municipality (or more) to join; c) any 9-12 program (greater than 50 students) that can contract with a municipality so that there

be more than 300 students; contracts must be 5-20 years.

In 1957 two provisions were included in legislation which provided financial incentives for reorganization (Title 20, Sub. 3456 and 3457).

Chapter 511 provided that when administrative districts are reorganized, the state subsidy paid annually to each district shall be supplemented by an additional 10% of that amount. These funds will be suspended unless the district provides: a) a kindergarten through 12 program; b) one secondary facility.

Chapter 501 stated that "to encourage the formation of larger school districts state aid will be provided for school construction, school debts (approved prior to reorganization), and Maine School Building Authority leases assumed by the District". Any administrative unit having over 500 pupils in grades 9-12 can qualify for the aid. Small units may qualify if the Board decides that consolidation is geographically or educationally impossible. The percentage of aid is based on average per pupil valuation.

Maryland

The 1968 General Assembly enacted on elaborate statute providing a county system of public schools throughout the state. Among other things this statute gave Baltimore City the full power to establish a system of free public schools. (See note: Article XI, Sec. 8, Constitution.) See also section 202-205 of the Maryland Annotated Code which indicates that the Mayor and City Council shall have full power and authority to establish a system of free public schools and may delegate supervisory powers and control to a Board of School Commissioners who are given the responsibility of managing the schools.

For the rest of the state, educational matters affecting a county are under control of a County Board of Education (section 3) each of which is in turn subject to the bylaws and policies of the State Board of Education (Bernstien v. Board of Education 245 Md. 464). Section 4 gives the County Boards discretionary power to create District Boards of Trustees, giving them specific powers and duties necessary for dealing with educational matters affecting a local school house district. The principal-teacher of each such school house district is the secretary of that Board of Trustees.

Section 61 deals with school consolidation. In this section the County Board is given power to consolidate schools "...whenever in their judgement it is practicable..." However, section 86 places the following limitation: no new School Attendance Area can be formed which contains less than 50 children between the ages 6-14, nor can a new district be formed if one of the old districts affected has, after the consolidation, less than 50 children ages 6-14, unless this arrangement receives the approval of the State Superintendent of Schools. Section 93 indicates that when any local district has an ADA of less than 12, the County Board closes it.

The education laws of Maryland have been subject to frequent modification. However, this modification has not altered in any substantial manner the basic county level organizational structure. Many of the changes relate to the composition of the Boards of each county and which people are to play dominant roles in the selection of board members. Maryland has twenty-three counties and twenty-four school districts.

Massachusetts

In 1944 the state of Massachusetts had 351 school districts. By the fall of 1968 this number had increased to 394.

In 1948 legislation was passed establishing regional school planning committees to study the advisability of establishing a regional school district and how this district would be organized. The enactment also included provisions outlining criteria for establishing these districts. Each town comprising the regional school district was to continue receiving state aid for educational purposes in the amount to which it would be entitled if no such district had been formed; and such regional school district was entitled to receive state aid for construction of regional schools (Laws of Massachusetts, 1949, Chapter 71.) In 1949 the Legislature passed Chapter 638 which provided the legal machinery for establishing regional school districts.

This legislation was amended in both 1950 and 1967. The 1950 legislation encouraged the formation of regional school districts by making an additional payment of 15% of the amount to which the town would be entitled, if such regional districts had not been formed (Laws of Mass., 1950, Chapter 774).

In 1967 an act was passed providing for the payment of state aid to certain cities and towns which were members of a regional school district. Regional school districts were to receive state aids for the construction of regional schools. Each town was to receive such state aid for educational purposes as it would be entitled to receive if such districts had not been formed. In addition to such state aid, the state treasurer was to pay annually to each town in a regional school district an amount equal to 15% of the amount of school aid (Laws of Mass. 1967, Chapter 779).

Michigan

For many years the trend in school reorganization in Michigan has been toward the establishment of twelve-grade community type districts. In 1932 there were almost 7,000 school districts in the state but this number had decreased to a little over 5,000 by the year 1948.

In 1949 legislation was enacted providing for the establishment of area study committees for the purpose of conducting studies of educational conditions and needs within specified areas and recommending changes in school district organization. Formation of these study committees was to be entirely optional and wholly dependent upon local initiative. Moreover, when committees were established, they were not required to develop reorganization proposals and submit them to the voters. In other words, legislation did not go beyond providing a means for study of redistricting problems. By 1954 there were still over 4,300 school districts in Michigan.

In 1955 the Michigan legislature enacted several provisions pertaining to reorganization. P.A. 1955, No. 261, Sec. 40, stated that any two or more school districts except districts of the first and second class, having seventy-five or more children between the ages of five and twenty years, could consolidate.

Section 402 of the same law discusses how the voters (10 or more of each district) can petition for consolidation proceedings.

P.A. 1955, No. 269, Sec. 431 provided for an annexation of one district to another by a majority vote of the electors of the district being annexed. Section 440 of the same act gave non-operating districts until July 1, 1956 to

either attach itself to one or more operating districts or reopen and operate its own school. Michigan law limits the frequency that a vote on consolidation can take place. Any vote on consolidation or annexation cannot be submitted more than once in six months unless requested for in a petition signed by 50% of the electors (P.A. 1955, No. 269, Sec. 511.)

P.A. 1955, No. 269, Sec. 461, states that transfer of land from one district to another may be effected by a resolution of the board of the district whose boundaries will be changed or when a petition signed by two-thirds of the district's voters is presented. If the amount of land which is to be detached exceeds more than 10% of the taxable valuation, an affirmative vote must be given by the majority of voters in the district from which the land is detached.

Act 289, Public Acts of 1964, assigned responsibility for developing plans for improved school district organization to the county. Under this legislation, reorganization studies were made mandatory. The intent of these studies was not only to incorporate all non-high school districts into existent K-12 programs, but also to combine effectively any existing small K-12 districts into units capable of offering a comprehensive educational program through the twelfth grade.

In 1968 the Michigan legislature enacted legislation which would supply financial assistance for insolvent school districts. (P.A. 1968, No. 32.) The act is "to provide for emergency financial assistance for insolvent districts; to prescribe certain duties and powers of the intermediate board of education in connection therewith; to provide for reorganization of such school districts; to provide for the continuance of the state committee on reorganization of school districts". If upon application for an emergency loan, a board of education certifies that the school district will not be able to balance its budget, the district shall be reorganized by the state board of education following recommendation by the state committee on reorganization of school districts. In the fall of 1968 Michigan had 668 school districts.

Minnesota

The reduction in the number of school districts in Minnesota has been a slow but steady process. In 1943-44 the state had a total of 7,681 school districts. By 1955-56 the number had been reduced to 3,633 and by June of 1969 had fallen below 1,000 for the first time.

In 1947 the legislature, in an attempt to encourage consolidation, passed a statute providing for the establishment of county survey committees. Their purpose was to study the school districts and unorganized territory of the county for the purpose of recommending desirable reorganization. In addition to studying ways to provide for a more efficient and economical basis for equalizing educational opportunity, these committees were to assemble and keep pertinent data relating to the same. Communication was to be established between school authorities and citizens in the county. (1947, C 741, p. 562).

The 1947 legislature also provided for the establishment of the State Advisory Commission. The purpose of this committee was to formulate aims, goals, principles, and procedures of public school organization in Minnesota. The commission was to review the recommendations of the county school survey committees and report its recommendations to the legislature. Any action recommended by the county and state survey committees had to be approved by the voters of the district. (1947, C. 421, p. 654.)

The 1951 session of the state legislature provided for the dissolution of some "closed" school districts. The law basically stated that any school district that has not held school for two years could be dissolved by the board of county commissioners on their own motion, or on a petition signed by a majority of the voters, or a majority vote at a legal meeting of the electors of the district if these majorities favored dissolution. (1951 C 706, p. 1250.)

The 1963 legislature enacted a statute to bring about the dissolution of most remaining closed school districts. The statute provided with only minor exceptions that any organized school district not maintaining a classified school after July 1, 1965, shall be dissolved as of the date such ceases to maintain a classified school. (1963, C 547 S 3, p. 802.)

In 1967 the legislature moved to hasten the elimination of all districts not maintaining classified secondary (high) schools. The provision stated that after July 1, 1971, all areas of the state must be included in an independent or special school district maintaining classified elementary and secondary schools, grades one through twelve. (1967, C 833, Sec. 1.) Any action in which the attachment of territory has not been completed by July 1, 1971, shall be subject to attachment orders of the commissioner with the approval of the state board of education.

Mississippi

The state of Mississippi has two basic types of governing bodies for the regulation of schools. The county board of education has jurisdiction over all schools within the county except the municipal separate school systems which are controlled by a board of trustees. The basic school code was established in 1942. Within the past two decades, the Extraordinary Session of 1953 established the current measures for the alteration, consolidation, and abolition of school districts. The basis for authority for the creation and reconstitution of school districts is Section 6328-01 of 1953.

Under Section 6274-06, the county board of education was granted full jurisdiction, power and authority at any regular or special meeting to change, alter, or abolish any existing district of such county other than the municipal separate school district. In addition,they could, with the consent of the board of trustees of the municipal separate school district, add any part of the county adjoining the same. It also could, with the consent of the municipal trustees, detach part of the municipal system and add it to the county system. This can be done without petition, but a notice must be published of the action. If 20% of the legal residents of the affected area petition, it must come up for election. If no petition is filed, it becomes final. Once a change has been made there is no recourse. If the voters turn down the proposed change, no effort can be made for the proposed change for two years.

Under provisions of Section 6274-08 of the 1953 code, the county superintendent of education was to serve as superintendent of any county-wide districts established.

Provision under 6411-03 for the addition of territory to the municipal separate school districts allows this district to add territory to its boundaries by agreement of the county board and the trustees of the municipal separate school district. The annexation is subject to approval of the state Finance Commission.

A municipal separate school district may be abolished upon the majority vote of the legal voters of the district. A special election for this purpose can be obtained by a petition of no less than 25% of the legal voters of that district (1953, 6411-04). If the corporate limits of any municipality are extended so as to include whole or part of an adjoining territory, that territory automatically becomes part of the municipal separate school district.

The 1953 legislation was mandatory in nature. All districts had to be reorganized by 1957 or lose state aid. From 1952 through 1969 there has been a decrease in over 1800 school districts to a present figure of 149.

Missouri

The General Assembly has accepted responsibility for public education in the state of Missouri and has enacted legislation for the creation and alteration of school districts. Under the present laws of Missouri, there are three major methods by which school districts may be established or enlarged: (1) reorganization, (2) consolidation, and (3) annexation.

The School District Reorganization Law of 1948 gave major impetus to reducing the number of school districts. A summary of its major features follows:

1. A county board was created in each county of the state by September of 1948.
2. The county board was to complete a study of the school districts in its county within six months and present to the state board of education for approval a proposed plan of district reorganization on or before May 1, 1949.
3. If the plan were approved by the state board, the county board would submit the proposed plan of districts to the voters within sixty days. For a proposed district to be adopted a majority of all the votes cast within the district was required.
4. As an incentive any newly reorganized district was entitled to $25,000 state building aid on a matching basis to construct new buildings needed as a result of the reorganization. In 1951 the law was amended to increase this aid not to exceed $50,000.
5. A proposed reorganized district could not be formed with less than $500,000 assessed valuation or fewer than 100 pupils in average daily attendance for the preceding year. In 1955 this was amended to require a proposed district to contain not less than 100 square miles of land area or fewer than 200 pupils in ADA. (1967 Cum. Sup. 163, Sect. 163.121).

The School District Reorganization Law, which remains in effect in essentially its original form, had a tremendous immediate impact upon school district organization. The number of school districts dropped from 8,422 on June 30, 1948 to 4,573 four years later. As of the fall of 1968 there were 789 districts.

Senate Bill No. 187 as enacted by the 75th General Assembly went into effect August 25, 1969. The law makes it mandatory for all common (3-director) elementary districts to merge with six-director districts within three years from the effective date of the Act. This will effect 142 three-director elementary districts.

Montana

In 1944 Montana had 1800 school districts. By the fall of 1968 this figure had been reduced to 758. Although there has been no legislation passed encouraging school district reorganization through the use of incentive aids, permissive legislation exists which establishes the process for bringing about reorganization.

Statute 75-1802 provides for the classification of districts into three classes. All districts having a population of 8,000 or more shall be districts of the first class. All districts having a population of more than 1,000 but less than 8,000 shall be districts of the second class, and all districts having a population of less than 1,000 shall be of the third class. This act also provided for the number of trustees for each class of districts and how the classification will change as the population changes. (L. 1963).

Statute 75-1805 deals with the creation of new districts out of other districts and with changing district boundaries. Basically it states that a new school district may be created out of portions of one or more existing school districts where the taxable valuation of property remaining in each district from which territory is taken is not reduced below $75,000.00 and where the number of census children between the ages of six and sixteen years is not reduced below fifteen. Methods for petitioning this organizational change are given. The taxable valuation of the new district must not be less than $75,000.00. This minimum taxable valuation of the proposed new district shall not apply where such proposed district contains at least 50,000 acres of non-taxable Indian land. (L 1965.)

Statute 75-1813 enacted in 1967 deals with consolidated districts, procedure in event of consolidation, annexation, and bonded debts. Any two or more school districts in Montana lying in one county may be consolidated, either by the formation of a district by consolidation, or by annexation of one or more districts. This may be done upon the request of the board of trustees in the two or more districts or a petition initiated by 20% of the qualified electors. Both actions are followed by a vote of the electors.

Statute 75-1810 enacted in 1969 states that when a new school district shall be formed as provided in section 75-1805, the bonded indebtedness of any school district or portion of school district affected by such bonds were issued and shall be paid for out of levies made against said original territory. When a new school district shall be formed as provided in section 75-1813, the bonded indebtedness of any school district affected by such consolidation or annexation shall become the indebtedness and obligation of the consolidated district and be paid by levies imposed upon the property therein. Provisions for consolidating districts in two or more counties are basically the same as above and are found in Statute 75-1813.1, 1967.

Nebraska

In 1944 Nebraska had 7,021 school districts. By the fall of 1968 this number had decreased to 1,992. During this period of time permissive legislation set up the machinery for changing district boundaries, abolishing districts, reorganization of districts, and dissolution of districts.

In 1949 major reorganization legislation was passed (sections 79-426.01 to 79-426.17). This legislation was of a permissive nature and included no financial incentives. One of the main features of the act was the creation of state and county school district reorganization committees. County

committees were required to consider reorganization procedures and plans submitted to them by the state committee but were not required to develop or adopt any of these plans. If the county committee decided to go along with the state committee's recommendations, the legislation established procedures for public hearings and elections.

In 1965 Statute 79-426.23 was enacted to permit twenty-five percent of the legal voters of Class I or II schools to petition for the dissolution of their school district (Class I schools maintain only elementary grades under the direction of a single board, and Class II school districts have a population of 1,000 people or less but maintain both elementary and high school grades under the direction of a single board). This petition is filed with the county committee for reorganization which has jurisdiction over the district. The majority of board members of the Class II, III, IV, or V districts to which the merger is proposed must approve of the merger. If both the state and county committees then approve, it is returned to the voters of the Class I or Class II districts for majority approval.

Nevada

As of 1947 Nevada had a fairly complex organization of school districts. There were six basic types: (1) school district, (2) joint school district, (3) union school district, (4) consolidated school district, (5) educational district, and (6) rural school district. The board of county commissioners had authority over boundary changes, approval of joint school districts and creation of new districts from unorganized territory.

In 1949 reorganization legislation was passed providing for the discontinuance of a district high school if attendance dropped below eight resident students. July 1, 1951 was set as the effective date (Statutes of Nevada, Chapter 229, 1949).

1951 legislation changed the original discontinuance date to July 1, 1953 and provided for the annexation of unorganized territory to an organized district. Previous to this there were only provisions for creation of a new district from unorganized territory (Statutes of Nevada, Chapter 150, 1951.)

A 1953 statute provided for withdrawal from a consolidated district for the purpose of forming a new district and also changed the petition procedure for annexation (Statutes of Nevada, Chapter 65, 1953).

1956 legislation provided for a major revision in Nevada's school district organization (Nevada Revised Statutes, 1967, Chapters 386.010 to 386.100). The school districts of the state were to be of two kinds; (a) county school districts, (b) joint school districts. County school systems were to be contiguous to county boundaries. Joint school districts, composed of all the territory of two or more contiguous county school districts were provided for. The act provided for the dissolution of existing school districts and the transfer of all functions to the county districts as of March 2, 1956.

Nevada has seventeen counties and seventeen school districts.

New Hampshire

In 1944 New Hampshire had 240 school districts. By the fall of 1968 this figure had reduced itself to 173. This has been accomplished by permissive legislation encouraging districts to form either cooperative or area districts as well as legislation providing for certain financial incentives.

In 1947 New Hampshire passed legislation stating that a cooperative school district was entitled to the shares of aid to which the pupils attending the cooperative district would have entitled the pre-existing districts, had they remained in the preexisting districts (N.H.S., 195:15).

In 1955 (N.H.S., 195:15a and 15b) legislation was enacted that provided for state building aid for those cooperating districts formed from two or more districts from two or more towns, but not for cooperating districts formed from two or more districts in one town unless this organization took place before July 1, 1955.

N.H.S., 195:15b provided for the amount of state aid for cooperative districts to be forty percent plus five percent for each preexisting district in excess of two and each sending district in excess of one, providing it didn't exceed fifty-five percent of the annual payment of principal. This was opposed to thirty percent for other districts. Districts constructing an educational administration building received forty percent for the cost of that building and thirty percent for their other construction costs.

In 1963 the legislature directed the state board of education to prepare and publish a plan subdividing the state into suggested cooperative school districts (N.H.S., 195:2). It also offered financial incentives to receiving and sending districts which undertook the obligations of an area school.

The 1963 legislature also provided incentive aid to preexisting districts which were willing to undertake the obligations of a cooperative district. The state board was to pay annually to each cooperative school district sums in accordance with the following schedule: for each pupil from a preexisting district who attends a cooperative school located in another preexisting district in average daily membership in the preceding school year, in a cooperative elementary school, $45; in a cooperative junior high or equivalent program, $60; and in a cooperative high school, $75. (RSA 198-18).

In 1967 the legislature provided additional financial incentive to cooperative school districts in the form of school building aid. (RSA 198: Sec. 15 a-g). School districts which have not been reorganized as cooperative districts are entitled to 30 percent of the annual payment on principal. No allowance is made for the payment of interest. Cooperative school districts are entitled to an amount ranging from 40 percent to 55 percent of the annual principal payment, depending on the number of preexisting districts which have been combined into the cooperative district.

New Jersey

The type of legislation in New Jersey pertaining to school district reorganization has resulted in a slight increase in the number of school districts in the state rather than a general decrease which is common in most states. In 1944 the number of school districts was 563. By 1968 this figure had increased to 568.

Back in 1903 legislation was first passed in New Jersey establishing the union-graded school district or a regional board of education. (1903 2nd Sp. Sess., C 1, p. 5). For over fifty years this early legislation remained basically the same.

1955 legislation gave specific guidelines for enlarging a school district. The amended law included the State Commissioner of Education in the study and investigation of district reorganization. This legislation also set up voting procedures. (R.S. 18:8-3, c. 159, par. 3).

In 1960, an act was passed authorizing the creation of certain regional school districts. (R.S. 18:8-26). This enabling legislation stated that the board of education of a consolidated school district or of two or more school boards and the State Commissioner of Education could call and conduct a special election for creation of a regional school district. They were also responsible for indicating whether the monies to be raised for support of this new district were to be apportioned on apportionment valuation or on average daily enrollment of pupils. Also included was a proposal for the authorization of school bonds for the new district.

Part of the explanation for the increase in school districts is due to the fact that although New Jersey has fifty-six regional districts, only eight are K-12. The other combinations are generally regional secondary districts which do not necessarily encourage the consolidation of the state's elementary districts.

Reorganization in the state is not discouraged by the state aid foundation program as apportionment of funds are adjusted according to reorganization. (18A 58-17). All districts are entitled to monies from the minimum aid fund if they provide school facilities for at least 180 days and conform to all rules and regulations formulated by the State Commissioner or the State Board of Education.

New Mexico

In a twenty year period from 1948 to 1968 the number of school districts in New Mexico has been reduced from 530 to 89. In 1941 a law was passed setting up a procedure for annual surveys by the state board of education for the purpose of determining the feasibility of making consolidation so as to effect the greatest possible economies and so that proper educational facilities could be furnished to all the school children of the state.

In 1955, legislation was passed giving power to county boards of education to determine by resolution that standards of education and substantial economies could be improved by consolidation of two or more rural school districts in the county. This resolution was submitted to the state board of education and if the board determined that standards could be improved, and economies actually achieved, the board could order the consolidation of such districts (Laws of New Mexico, Chapter 74, 1955).

In 1959 (Chapter 357, 1959), state school reorganization survey committees were created to conduct necessary studies and surveys of each possible school district reorganization to determine recommendations for reorganization, and make reports of them to the state board of education.

In 1965 a major provision was enacted providing for reorganization of rural school districts in the state (Chapter 30, 1965). Each county board was to prepare a plan for its administrative reorganization to combine it with an existing adjacent municipal or independent administrative unit or units. This plan was to be submitted to the state board of education on or before June 30, 1965 for approval. Should the revised plan have been

disapproved, or if the county board refused to submit a plan, the state board was to have effected the administrative reorganization of the county system by combining its units with existing adjacent municipal units or by a new independent district to become effective not later than September 1, 1965.

In 1967, Laws of New Mexico, Chapter 16, 77-3-1 through 77-3-8 all deal with reorganization. The pertinent features included a statement that every public school was to be located within the geographical boundaries of a school district. It also provided for the creation of new districts within existing school districts upon receipt of and according to a resolution requesting such creation to the state board of education by the local school board of the existing school district. The existing district and new district to be created must have a minimum of 500 pupils each and both districts must maintain high schools unless an exception is granted by the state board of education.

New York

While the administration of schools and the formulation of general policies have been centralized in the State Education Department and substantial aid has been granted and apportioned through action of the legislature, the immediate control and operation of the schools of New York have to a large extent been vested in the localities.

The first common school districts were laid out under the law of 1812. The law not only provided for the original school district system and the creation of additional school districts as new counties were formed, but also provided for the consolidation of school districts thus created. In 1853 a specific enactment known as the Union Free School Law provided for the merging of two or more adjoining districts. In 1925 a more efficient law entitled the Central Rural School Act was passed which provided that in addition to the apportionments granted to union free schools, central school districts were given special apportionments, including all the quotas to which the separate constituent districts would have been entitled, and were aided by the state in erecting, enlarging, and remodeling their buildings and in transporting pupils.

This central district law forms the basis for school district reorganization, with some modifications, that exists in the state today. Basically, it follows a permissive pattern authorizing the commissioner of education to lay out the proposed boundaries of a new district. From that point, the voters in the proposed area may take the necessary steps to vote on the proposal.

Although the law gives the commissioner discretionary authority to set up a proposed central district, he has by policy required the districts desiring to reorganize to so indicate. The established policy is that before the commissioner will act, the petitions must indicate widespread support in both the centers of population and areas outside of these centers.

The Bureau of Rural Administrative Services of the state department of education studies the proposed central area to determine whether it meets approved criteria of size, extent of educational potentialities, and other characteristics. If the Bureau finds that the district meets standards and that the petitions express the true sentiments of the voters, the commissioner may issue an order laying out the central district. After the order has been issued and posted, the law requires petitions requesting the commissioner to call a meeting so that a vote may be taken to determine whether the central

district shall be organized. If the petitions are in order, the commissioner calls an election. A favorable majority of the total votes cast is necessary to establish the new central district.

In 1946 a joint legislative committee on the state education system presented a master plan for the reorganization of school districts. This master plan was to guide the commissioner of education in laying out new central districts when voters of uncentralized areas expressed a desire for reorganization.

In 1948 the legislature passed the Intermediate District Law. Under this act, a sufficient group of central and union free districts could combine to provide to all of the schools of the area those kinds of educational services that the individual districts could not provide. A provision of this law made it possible for each supervisory district, later two or more contiguous supervisory districts, to form a Board of Cooperative Educational Services to provide services to the local districts. These boards received state aid and generally had the power granted intermediate districts except that they could not levy taxes or own real property.

New York is one state that has offered substantial financial incentives for reorganization of school districts. Enlarged City School Districts were encouraged by both the 1952 and 1956 legislature. In 1952 Chapter 810 was amended by Section 1533 which empowered the Commissioner of Education to create enlarged city school districts by consolidation of city school districts of cities having less than 125,000 inhabitants. Although the initiative could be taken by the Commissioner, a majority of the voters of the areas to be consolidated had to agree and the local boards of education had to consent. If the consolidation was approved and in order to assure that the new district would provide at the very least equivalent services to the districts as they existed before consolidation, an annual apportionment of money in addition to the regular apportionment allotted a school district was to be given to the newly formed district. In 1956 the legislature in Chapter 718, Section 3602, Sub. 9, increased the apportioned amount substituting formulas based upon greatly increased full valuation of property. This same section today, (1968-1969) which sets forth the state's general aid program, requires that in order to participate, the district must employ eight or more teachers. It must levy taxes (real property and non-property) equivalent to the higher of the following: a tax rate of $11 per $1,000 of actual valuation; a tax rate equivalent to the rate required to meet the local share in the district of average wealth at operating expenditure levels between $678 and $760 per W.A.D.A. The maximum required rate is $12.34. Building aid is not paid to districts scheduled for reorganization unless the aid will not impede reorganization.

In 1947 Chapter 859 was amended to empower the Commissioner to make new central school districts or annex to existing central school districts, territory not contained within a city school district in a city having a population of more than 5,000 inhabitants. Any new central school district organized under this article was to receive from the time of its organization from the state the same quotas and apportionments which a union free school district was entitled to receive. In addition all quotas were to be apportioned to the central district under the same conditions as though such a district had not been created and as though a school had been maintained in each of such districts within the central district. If this district had been created out of territory consisting of two or more existing central school districts, such

new central school district was entitled to receive the same apportionments as it would have received had all the districts included in the two or more existing central districts been originally laid out and organized as a central school district. Chapter 890 passed the same year provided that there shall also be an amount paid to each central district containing a school district that continues to exist after becoming a part of a central school district for the purpose of paying any outstanding indebtedness of such school district, including interest, less three mills on each dollar of actual valuation of the taxable property in such existing district.

Although building aids of one kind or another had existed for central school districts since the 1920's, the 1956 legislature set forth a new enactment that related to the apportionment of public monies to central school districts, especially the building quotas. (Chapter 720, 1806). Any central district which was organized was to receive an apportionment to be known as a building quota. What distinquished this from other previous building quotas was the means of calculating the "ceiling" cost on the basis of pupil enrollment which resulted in a substantial incentive. Adjustments were provided for trends in school population and the paying off of previous bonded indebtedness. In 1962, Chapter 616, Sec. 1, provided that no new schoolhouse was to thereafter be erected, repaired, enlarged or remodeled in any school district except in a city school district in a city having 700,000 inhabitants or more, at an expense that was to exceed $10,000 until the plans had been submitted to the commissioner of education for his approval.

The last major reorganization legislation passed in the state of New York was in 1965 and pertained to "Reorganized School Districts: City, Central, or Union Free." Chapter 745 amended the education law to keep current the state plan for school district reorganization and adjusted appropriations accordingly. It limited the continuance of school districts not maintaining home schools. It also limited continuance of certain contract systems by school districts not maintaining home high schools. It also established a procedure for granting state aid for school building purposes to school districts scheduled for reorganization and granted additional state aid to certain school districts after reorganization.

The nearly 3½ million public school children in New York State are distributed over a total of 749 school districts. Some do not operate schools at all while some operate elementary grades only. Over one-half of the districts enroll fewer than 1200 pupils. Surprisingly, the New York City Metropolitan Counties account for 60% of the districts having no high schools.

North Carolina

North Carolina's school district organization is centered around the county administrative unit. The state board of education and the county boards have a great deal of control over the number of districts that operate within each county.

Article 9, Section 3 of the Constitution of North Carolina states that each county of the state shall be divided into a convenient number of districts. Within the district one or more public schools must be maintained at least six months every year. The county is an administrative unit of the state. The county boards of education are given power to create, divide, abolish, and consolidate school attendance areas in accordance with a county wide plan. This same article gave the power to the state board of education for the division

of the state into a convenient number of school districts.

In 1955 the state legislature more clearly defined the process for creation and modification of school districts by the state board of education. (1955, Ch. 1372, Art. 8, S. 1 and ch. 432.) Section 115-74 provided for encouragement to city administrative units to consolidate with county units by allowing for the indebtedness of the city unit to be assumed by the county unit.

Section 115-76 of the 1955 legislation gave the county boards of education the power and authority to consolidate schools located in the same district, and with the state board of education, to consolidate school districts or other school areas over which the board has full control, whenever and wherever in its judgement the consolidation will better serve the educational interests of the county or any part of it. The state board was to see to it that high schools would not operate with an average daily attendance of less than sixty pupils unless geographic or other conditions made it impractical to provide for the students in another way. Specific guidelines were outlined for the board which emphasized a concern for pupil and community needs (i.e. inconveniences resulting to students, importance of such school to the people of the community and their interest and support of the school).

In 1948 North Carolina had 172 school districts. In 1968 this number had decreased to 157.

A North Carolina State Board of Education Policy to be effective for consolidations occurring on or after January 1, 1969 states that in the event of consolidation of two or more administrative units into one administracive unit, the General Control allotment and the allotment of supervisors from the state Nine Months School Fund to the consolidated unit shall not be less than the General Control allotment of supervisors to the separate units for the first and second full fiscal years of the consolidation.

North Dakota

Compared with other more densely populated Midwestern states, North Dakota has never had a very large number of school districts, but the great majority have been small in terms of pupil enrollment. In 1944 there were 2,274 school districts. By the fall of 1968 this number had decreased to 451.

In 1947 a comprehensive school district reorganization law was enacted, containing favorable provisions for organizing and conducting a statewide redistricting program. The legislation provided for the establishment of the Committee on School District Reorganization with the State Superintendent of Instruction as one of its members. This committee had the duty of appointing a state reorganization director; distributing funds appropriated for carrying on the reorganization program; assisting county committees; to examine, and either approve or disapprove, reorganization plans submitted by county committees; and to appoint county reorganization committees where they had not been appointed. The act also set up county reorganization committees which within nine months were required to make a comprehensive study of the school districts in the county, and within one-half year was to prepare a comprehensive reorganization plan to be submitted to the state committee for approval.

A 1949 amendment specified that when a part of an existing district was included in a reorganization and the remaining portion had an assessed valuation of less than $100,000 for each teacher employed, that portion was to be annexed to an adjacent district.

A 1951 amendment changed the method of ratification of a reorganization by the people, requiring a favorable majority vote in each district included in the proposed reorganization. The 1951 legislature also abolished the Committee on School District Reorganization and placed the responsibility for reorganization in the hands of the state superintendent, setting certain requirements that made his task more difficult. It is probable that the change in voting procedures and the abolishing of the committee had a detering effect on reorganization, for between 1951 and 1957 there was an average drop of twenty-five districts a year compared to a drop between the three years of 1948-51 of over eighty districts.

In 1957 the legislature passed the North Dakota School District Reorganization Act. Chapter 15-22-1 stated that the County Superintendent was to notify the Board of County Commissioner when any school district in the county had had its assessed valuation reduced to an amount which would no longer enable the district to raise the funds necessary to carry on normal school operation. Dissolution of the district was to follow with attachment to an adjacent district.

Chapter 15-53-01 was specifically entitled an "Act to provide for the reorganization of school districts." Its purpose was the formation of new school districts and the alteration of the boundaries of established school districts in order to provide a more nearly equalized educational opportunity for pupils of the common schools, a high degree of uniformity of tax rate among districts, and a wiser use of public funds expended for the support of common school systems. Among other things it named the state board of public school education as the state committee school district reorganization. The act contained many similarities to the 1947 legislation but was more specific in defining the comprehensiveness of county studies. The act left the final shape of the reorganization in the hands of the people in the affected districts and left the technical phases in the hands of the county committees and state board.

One section of the legislation, 15-53-09, provides for continuance of elementary schools in reorganized districts with as few as six children, provided that they live within 2½ miles of the school building and the parents of these children present a written request. Such a provision, it would seem, does not encourage reorganization.

North Dakota has very permissive reorganization legislation but between 1957 and 1968 this legislation resulted in a decrease of over 1500 school districts.

Ohio

Originally Ohio laws provided for six types of school districts: 1) city, 2) local, 3) exempted village, 4) county, 5) joint high school and 6) joint vocational school districts. In 1943-44 there were 1,605 school districts.

In 1943 laws were passed stating that no new village school districts were to be created and any existing village district falling below 3,000 population was to become a part of the county school district. (3311.04-3311.10).

This same law provided that populations in excess of 3,000 could exempt themselves from county district control if the majority of the full local board voted to do so. This was later revised to include only those districts able to classify themselves as city districts (3311.34).

Ohio statutes dealing directly with consolidation all have effective dates after 1953 and divide into two categories: "transfer of territory" and "creation of new districts."

Statutes written in terms of transfer of territory involve one district surrendering its identity to another already existing district. In the case of local districts (3311.22 and one local to another local and 3311.231, local district to city or exempt village district), initiative may be taken either by the county board or upon petition signed by 55% of electors of the district. When proposed by the county board, 30 days public notice must be given during which time a majority of voters in affected territory may petition a referendum. When placed on the ballot, approval of transfers requires a simple majority of those voting on the issue. 3311.24 stipulates procedures for transfers of city or exempted village districts. These transfers are initiated by petition of 75% of the electors in the territory to be transferred. All transfers of territory are subject to acceptance by a majority of the full board of the receiving district.

On January 1, 1955 the legislature created its first state board of education. The State Board, through the State Department of Education, has exerted considerable influence in the reorganization of school districts in Ohio by formulating and adopting certain policies.

The trend toward greater initiative from the state department is evidenced in section 3311.38 (effective 7-28-59), authorizing the state board to implement studies of districts to document needs for transferring territory. With the evidence from these studies the state board may adopt resolutions of transfers and present their case to the electors of the involved territory. The resolution of transfer will be placed on the next ballot of a general or primary election and a simple majority of those voting on the issue will either carry or reject the resolution. 3311.38 further evidences increased state department involvement due to a subsequent amendment (effective 8-8-67) which authorized the state board to direct the state superintendent to make the necessary studies and recommendations for transfer of territories.

Statutes establishing procedures for creating new districts in contrast to transfer statutes do not provide any real means for local initiative. 3311.26 authorizes county boards to propose combining existing local districts into a new district. In concession to the local level the referendum may be called with only 35% of electors in the affected districts petitioning. 3311.37 authorizes the state board to propose combining of districts of any types after appropriate studies and place the question of creating a new district on the ballot in the affected districts. In both situations simple majority of those voting on the proposal carries the question. One of Ohio's statutes is directed toward creation of new districts. 3311.28 requires that all districts created after 10-2-53 must have 1-12 programs.

1967 legislation provided that in the paying of state aid to districts created under sections 3311.26 or 3311.27, the amount paid shall not be less in any of the three succeeding fiscal years following the creation, than the sum of the amounts allocated under Chapter 3317 of the Revised Code to the districts separately in the year of the creation. This same rule is to apply

in the case of a school district which is transferred to another district or districts. (1967, 3317.04).

Other legislation in Ohio having some impact on school district reorganization is Section 3301.16, which authorized the state board of education to revoke the charter of any school district which fails to meet the standards prescribed by the board. Following revocation the state board may dissolve the district and transfer its territory to one or more adjacent districts. Although not having such a direct impact, Section 113.04 requires the approval of the state board of education for a local district to increase its net indebtedness beyond six percent of the value of property assessed for taxation. Such authority may possibly tend to discourage a district from perpetuating an inadequate size unit.

Chapter 3318, Revised Code, establishes eligibility of school districts for state building assistance. Appropriated funds are made available to districts on a priorities system established by the state board of education in accordance with the law. One factor included in establishing priority is that the enrollment in grade 9-12 is inclusive or is projected to be, 500 students.

In twenty years Ohio through the use of generally permissive legislation with a few minimum financial incentives has decreased its number of school districts by over 50%. In the fall of 1968 the state had 653 school districts. Effective July 1, 1968 all school districts were to maintain instruction in grades 1-12 inclusive except with the approval of the state board. As of September 9, 1969 only five of 639 districts provide only elementary instruction.

Oklahoma

Prior to 1949 there is little record of legislation in Oklahoma which might have effected the decrease, since that time, in the number of school districts. 1948-2712 districts. 1968-729 districts. A 1943 law did provide that only an entire school district could be annexed to another district. (Laws of 1943, p. 208-210, par. 1-10, 12).

In 1949 the legislature passed a law providing that territory comprising all or part of a school district may be annexed to an adjacent district or to two or more such districts. This provision provided for greater flexibility and opportunities for the formation of new and larger districts. There was also built into the law a provision for an appeal in a relatively short period of time by a minority (25%) of the eligible school district electors. (Laws of 1949, p. 545, art. 7, par. 1).

The 1949 law also provided for the elimination of non-operating school districts. This is mandatory legislation which provided that a district not maintaining a school within the district for two consecutive years prior to July 1, 1949 or had a legal average daily attendance of less than thirteen children was disorganized and annexed to a district or districts maintaining transportation within the area. The same would hold true for districts reaching that status after July 1, 1949. This figure was changed to 20 ADA in 1968.

This same legislation required that an annexed district or part of a district, whether volunatry or not, was to assume their full share of all legal bonded indebtedness to which they are or were annexed. This was a change from the 1943 laws which in cases of voluntary annexation, neither the annexing district nor the annexed district would assume any part of the bonded indebtedness of the other district. In 1951 this section was again amended to state that the legal sinking fund indebtedness of the annexed district would be a charge

against the territory comprising such district, and that the existing bonded indebtedness of the annexing district would not apply to the annexed district for a period of not less than three years. (Laws 1951, p. 238, par. 1).

Paragraph 7-5 provided for the consolidation of two or more adjacent districts according to standards, rules and procedures established by the state board of education. The state board was placed in a leadership position especially in the area of educating local boards as to those important factors which would most nearly insure efficient and economical administrative units.

In 1961 a law was enacted providing for the attachment of federally-owned reservations belonging to the United States government to any school district within the same transportation area.

A state board regulation in 1966 limited high school accreditation to schools having an ADA of 55 students for the 1967-68 school year. Elementary schools were to have an ADA of 30 for grades 1-6 or 40 ADA for grades 1-8 in order to be accredited.

Oregon

In 1919, Oregon had a peak number of 2,556 school districts. Improved roads and the advent of school bus transportation following the war led to the merging of many small districts with adjoining larger districts. In the 20-year period between 1919 and 1939, 594 school districts in Oregon were dissolved by consolidations and annexations. In the following 20-year period from 1939 to 1959, an additional 1,303 school districts were dissolved.

In this latter period, most of the districts were dissolved as a result of consolidations but in 1947 the Oregon Legislature passed legislation that brought about the dissolution of 252 non-operating school districts by legislative edict.

The 1951 and the 1955 Legislative sessions of the Oregon Legislature seriously considered the area of school district reorganization, but other than appropriating money for an extensive study of Oregon elementary and secondary education by Doctor Holy of Ohio State University, little effective legislation was enacted. However, the Holy report did alert the Oregon public to the need for major reorganization of the state's school districts.

The 1957 legislature enacted the School District Reorganization Act. This legislation required that the school boards in each county elect a 9-member Reorganization Committee to study the school district organization within its county and to prepare and develop plans for the forming of adequate school districts within each county. After the committee prepared plans, the plans were presented at a public hearing and, if necessary, revised and finally adopted by the committee and sent to the state board of education for approval. The state board before approving any plan was authorized to conduct a public hearing on the plan. If the state board approved a plan, it was returned to the committee that had prepared it and the plan was then submitted to the voters of the proposed district for their approval or rejection. The School District Reorganization Act of 1957 had few mandatory features, yet the dedicated work of County Reorganization Committees resulted in substantial progress. There were organized groups in the state that opposed the School District Reorganization Act, but their efforts to repeal the Act by referring it to the people failed in 1961. The Act was amended in 1959, 1961, and in 1963, and is still

in operation. In 1962, the County Committees were dissolved and their responsibility for preparing and initiating school reorganization plans within a county was delegated to the County Intermediate Education District Board.

Under provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1957, 201 school districts have been dissolved and ninety-eight new administrative school districts have been formed. In addition, during this same period of time, 226 school districts have been dissolved by voluntary consolidation procedures. As of June 30, 1969, Oregon has 356 school districts.

Types of School Districts in Oregon Today

Oregon's 356 school districts are classified by type as follows:

153 unified school districts that provide education for grades 1-12
144 elementary school districts that offer education in grades 1-8 and are component parts of a union high school district, that in turn provides education for grades 1-12.
32 elementary school districts that provide education in grades 1-12 but do not operate a high school. These districts contract with another district that operates a high school for the education of their high school pupils.
27 union high school district that provide education for grades 9-12.

At the present time 82% of all pupils in average daily membership in Oregon attend school in unified school districts. This percentage is slightly below the average for the nation.

Three Procedures Available in Oregon for School Mergers - Leading to Unification

Present Oregon Laws provide 3 methods whereby school mergers may be effected. These are:

(ORS 330.005 to 330.135) 1. Merger Procedure. This procedure may be instituted by the Intermediate Education District Board and must be initiated by it upon petition of three residents of the school district. The IED Board considers the proposal and if it meets stated criteria in the law, issues an order for the merger to take place. A public hearing is advertised and held. After the merger order is issued, a period in which patrons may remonstrate is provided. If no remonstrances are received, the order and the merger become effective at a prescribed date. If remonstrances are filed by an affected district, an election is held first in the least populous district from which a remonstrance is filed. Approval by the voters in any district filing a remonstrance must be by a majority of those voting in the election. No election is held in any district from which a remonstrance is not filed.

(ORS 330.505 to 330.780) 2. Reorganization Procedure. (School District Reorganization Act of 1957 as amended in 1959, 1963, and 1965),

The plan of reorganization is initiated only by the Intermediate Education District Board of a county. This Board is authorized to initiate and prepare all plans for administrative school districts.

The plan must designate the boundaries of the proposed administrative school district; must provide for an equitable adjustment of the assets and liabilities of all affected districts; must designate whether the proposed district is to be zoned or not zoned for board members; must provide whether local school committees are to be be provided for each attendance unit, if the IED Board determines that such committees are necessary; must designate the number of directors (5-7 or 9) in a zoned district; must determine the term of office of the first board; and must designate whether school board members are to be elected at large or within zones. The plan must also specify the IED to which the proposed district shall report.

After the committee (IED Board) prepares the plan, they advertise and hold a public hearing on the plan and may revise it in light of evidence presented at the hearing. They adopt the plan and publicly advertise their adoption.

They submit the plan to the state board for approval. The state board upon receipt of the plan delays action on it for 30 days during which time any interested party from the affected area may remonstrate by submitting his or her remonstrance to the IED Board and the Secretary of the state board of education. If such a remonstrance is received, the state board advertises and holds a hearing on the plan and following the hearing, approves or rejects the plan.

If the plan is approved by the Board, the IED Board advertises and calls an election. Approval of the plan by the majority of voters in all affected school districts is required for the proposed district to become operative.

After the new district is approved by voters, the IED Board conducts an election for board members of the new district. The new district becomes effective on a date prescribed by law.

Under the Reorganization Act from 1957 to 1969, ninety-eight administrative school districts have been formed using the above reorganization procedure. The largest of the districts formed has slightly over 17,000 pupils. The smallest district formed has fewer than 100 pupils.

(ORS 335.495)

3. Unification of Union High School Districts by Extension of the high school program downward to include all grades 12 to 1.

This procedure has been in effect for many years but major amendments made in 1965 has changed the voting procedure to effect unification.

The procedure of unifying a union high school may be initiated either by a resolution of the union high school board or upon petition of 100 residents of the union high school district. The union high school board advertises and holds an election on the proposition of extending the program of the union high school downward to include all grades 12 through 1. If a majority of the voters within the union high school district cast ballots in favor of the proposition, the union high school board notifies the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the favorable election and requests his approval of the extended program of studies. Upon the Board's receipt of the superintendent's approval of the extended course of study, all elementary districts composing the union high school district are dissolved except the most populous elementary district and the boards of all elementary districts are terminated. The board of the Union high school district becomes the new unified district. The school district number of the new district will be the number of the most populous elementary district. The new district becomes effective on the date the Superintendent of Public Instruction approves the extended course of study of the union high school district. This procedure has had extensive use in recent years and has resulted in the unification of 17 union high school districts since 1957.

Pennsylvania

Reorganization activity was initiated in large part by legislation enacted in 1947 requiring county boards of school directors to prepare countywide reorganization plans. It was greatly stimulated by financial incentives, provided in 1949 and extended and liberalized in 1951. Additional stimulation came from state aid provided to help pay annual rentals on buildings constructed by the State Public School Building Authority. School districts decreased over the period of years from 2514 in 1951-52 to a total of 580 in the fall of 1968.

A 1911 law established five classes of schools based on the population of the school district. This classification has had implications for the distribution of state aid payments. First class districts were to have a population of 500,000 to 1.5 million. Second class districts were to have between 50,000 and 500,000 population. Third class districts were to have between 5,000 and 30,000 population and districts below 5,000 were to be fourth class. In 1961 the legislature revised this classification scheme to say that each school district as of July 1, 1965 with a population of 22,000 to 30,000 was to be considered third class and districts below 22,000 were to be considered fourth class.

A 1949 legislation provided the basic foundation for the reorganization of schools in Pennsylvania. Three different methods of enlarging local school districts were in existence in 1949; the joint board method, the union district

method, and the merger method. The 1949 legislation refined the reorganization procedure for forming these types of school districts and included provisions for the mandatory consolidation of ungraded, one room schools. (P.L. 63.1).

P.L. 30 provided supplemental payments to districts of certain classes. This was expanded upon in 1951 to provide: A) $500 per teaching unit (30 elementary ADM-22 secondary ADM) multiplied by the standard reimbursement fraction for each joint elementary or secondary school operated by school districts of the third and fourth class and to districts of the second class approved by the Department of Public Instruction prior to July 1, 1954. B) $800 per teaching unit multiplied by the standard reimbursement fraction for a union or merged school district of the third or fourth class within or comprising an approved administrative unit.

The 1959 legislature added two parts to the supplemental payment plan. It revised P.L. 30 to give $800 per teaching unit multiplied by the districts subsidiary account reimbursement fraction to second class districts resulting from the merger or union of two or more third or fourth class districts or from population growth. It also gave $800 per teaching unit multiplied by twice the total number of teaching units reported by third and fourth class districts which join either a first class A district or a second class district subsequent to the first Monday of July 1961 for the first year. For every year after that, $800 per teaching unit multiplied by the total number of teaching units resulting from the merger or union less the number of teaching units for which no payment was allowed on the first payment and by the subsidiary account reimbursement fraction of the district of residence. $500 per teaching unit multiplied by the total number of teaching units brought into jointure from third or fourth classes joining with a school district of the first class A or second class subsequent to July 1, 1954 by the subsidiary account reimbursement fraction of the first class A or of the second class district of residence.

In 1963, Act 463, provided for consolidating and organizing to provide for vocational-technical education. Before January 1, 1965 all school districts of the second, third, and fourth class of the county were to submit proposals for the establishment of vocational-technical areas. It set forth a state reimbursement to every school district of no less than $75 for every resident pupil in an area vocational-technical school. Other catagories provided aid for curriculum improvement and school building costs.

Act 580, passed by the legislature, repealed, effective June 30, 1968, all supplemental payment incentives of Public Law 30. The total amount of money paid out under the provision of this act were incorporated into the basic state aid payment program.

Rhode Island

In 1904 the state legislature in Rhode Island abolished over 300 school districts and established thirty-nine districts whose boundaries were coterminous with cities and towns. Over the years Rhode Island has tried to encourage the smaller districts to combine into larger districts through the use of permissive legislation and financial incentives.

A 1938 law had guaranteed no reduction of state aid because of consolidation and awarded each town $100 annually for each department of the consolidated school. In 1960 the legislature repealed the state aid guarantees, the permissive consolidation powers and superintendent's salary reimbursement provisions. (1960, 27#12).

The 1955 Rhode Island legislature superimposed permissive legislation to create regional school districts to operate schools. In 1958 this legislation was expanded upon and allowed for regional districts to operate as a school district and as an intermediary unit. Secondly, it removed approval requirements of the regional districts from the general assembly and advisory requirements from the department of education. (Chapter 197 of the 1958 Session.)

Since 1958 both the 1960 and 1962 legislatures have made changes in the foundation program to encourage the towns to consolidate into regional districts.

In fact, to encourage reorganization three types of incentive aids have been devised:

A. 16-7-20 (1967, 160#3) In the case of regional school districts, the state's share shall be increased by 2% for each grade so consolidated for the first two years of operation.
B. 16-7-40 (1962, 47#1) In the case of regional school districts, the school housing aid ratio shall be increased by 2% for each grade so centralized.
C. 16-7-40 (1962, 47#1) In the case of regional school districts, providing vocational training programs, the school housing aid ration shall be increased by 5% in addition to the 2% appropriated above for each grade so centralized.

Whether or not this legislation has had a profound effect is hard to judge on the basis of statistics available for there were thirty-nine school districts in 1948 and in 1968 this number is listed at forty.

South Carolina

In 1943-44 South Carolina had 1,742 school districts. As of June 27, 1969 this figure had been reduced to ninety-three districts with the largest reduction coming between 1943-44 and 1952 when the count was diminished by over 1,200.

The 1962 Code of Laws contains the basic provisions for school district organization under which the state operates today.

In 1952 the legislature set up the general provisions for establishing school districts (1952 Code, 21-111). 1952 Code, 21-112 provided that the alteration of boundaries or division of school districts within a county could only come about by: 1) an act of the General Assembly relating to one or more counties; 2) authorization of the county boards under the following conditions:

A. Written approval of the Senator and the entire House legislative delegation from the county involved.
B. Upon a written petition signed by at least four-fifths of the qualified electors within the limits of the school districts involved.
C. Upon a written petition signed by one-third of the qualified electors followed by an election where a majority of the voters is needed to approve the proposal.

1952 Codes 21-113 and 21-114.3 provide for the assumption of all assets and liabilities of the two or more school districts forming a new district by

the newly formed district on a justly proportioned basis.

1952 Code 21-114 stated that all school districts in the county could be consolidated into one school district, but districts from two or more counties can do so only by joint action of the respective county boards of education.

Reorganization in the state was encouraged by the enactment in 1952 of a 3% sales tax that provided school districts with funds for school construction (Code of 1952, 21-274) and school bus transportation (Code of 1952, 21-833). At the time of the enactment of the sales tax the Educational Finance Commission was established to handle the building and transportation program with the mandate to implement the consolidation of school districts so far as was practical (1952 Code, 21-52). Since this enactment the number of school districts in the state has been reduced by over 1,400.

The following quote is taken from the Cumulative Supplement regarding financial aids to the districts.

ANNUAL GRANT 21-272. - In order to assist school districts in financing needed capital improvements, the General Assembly shall annually allocate to the Board a sum equivalent to twenty-five dollars multiplied by the number of pupils enrolled in grades one through twelve of the public schools during the school year next preceding the year for which the allocation is made. Provided, that the amount allocated for the fiscal year 1969-70 and each year thereafter shall be computed at the rate of thirty dollars per pupil. Provided, further, that for no year shall the amount allocated be less than the total sum required to meet principal and interest payments becoming due in that fiscal year on state school bonds. (1952 Code 21-272; 1951 (47) 546; 1953 (48) 181; 1967 (55) 719).

Although South Carolina has experienced generally successful reorganization through the use of permissive legislation supplemented by some incentive aids, it is possible that there may be some factors in existence that prevent a completely efficient reorganization program. Several of the forty-six county districts in the state have special provisions that would discourage reorganization into larger, more efficient systems. Recodification now underway, if adopted, could clarify many weaknesses. Also, state funds which pay for the salaries of teachers assist small districts in operating with only minimal size classes to qualify for the state payment. (Sec. 21-253, 1968 Cumulative Supplement to 1962 Code of Laws.)

South Dakota

In 1951 South Dakota reorganization legislation was enacted permitting formation of county committees to prepare reorganization plans. By September, 1954, committees had been formed in eighteen counties and reorganization elections had been held in three counties.

A further attempt on the part of the legislature of South Dakota to stimulate school reorganization occurred in 1955. At this time, the entire section of Chapter 15.20, "School districts, General Provisions Relating to All," South Dakota's 1939 Codes were repealed. An immediate result of this revision was, first, to stipulate that school districts were to be limited to four types: independent; common; county independent; county common. As defined in S.D.C. 1960, Supp. 15.2002, an independent district is one which operates either a twelve year school program or an accredited high school. County independent school districts must operate the same type program; however, they are

the only public school district within a county and are governed by county boards of education. A common school district is one which operates less than a full twelve year program and does not operate an accredited high school, and a county common would again be the only one in the county and is governed by a county board of education.

The remaining subsections of this Chapter S.D.C. 1960, Supp. 15-2004 - 15.2023 provided legislation to permit districts to merge, consolidate, or reorganize. Some mandatory reorganization was prescribed (Chap. 41, 1955), but it also emphasized providing a structure under which districts could organize voluntarily. That is, provisions were made for local participation in developing county master plans; for recommendation and appraisal by the state department of education; and for the necessary vote of approval by the affected citizenry.

A substantial change in this policy occurred during the 1967 General Sessions of the South Dakota Legislature. During this session the following laws were approved--S.L. 67, Ch. 38, "Amending Law Relating To School Reorganization And Creating State Commission On Elementary And Secondary Education," and S.L. 67, Ch. 40, "Amending Law Relating To School District Reorganization."

The major impact of S.L. 67, Ch. 38, noted in S. 3, is that "All territory or land area within the state of South Dakota shall on or before July 1, 1970, become a part of an independent school district offering an accredited school program and meeting the standard adopted by the state board of education." Furthermore, this act empowers the State Commission on Elementary and Secondary Education to hold hearings and reorganize any land areas which have not become a part of a 12-year school district as of or on January 1, 1969, or to be effective on July 1, 1970. At these hearings the Commission is then enjoined to take one of the following courses of action: "(a) create an approved independent school district, or (b) combine, attach, and make any boundary changes or adjustment of land area as may be deemed necessary, or (c) request additional information and study prior to taking any course of action under (a) or (b) above."

The state legislature has helped to transform former permissive legislation into mandatory reorganization legislation, notably by providing the following dictates in reference to the types of districts which are directed to be combined with others, effective January 1, 1969.

(1) A school district with all the taxable property in such district assessed at a lower valuation than one hundred thousand dollars. (Chap. 41, 1955)
(2) A school district which fails to elect a school board member or members as provided by law for two successive annual elections. (Chap. 41, 1955)
(3) A school district which by sixty per cent of the votes in a special election approves the dissolution of the school district and its combination with another school district or districts. (Chap. 41, 1966)
(4) A school district which has failed to operate a school during the preceding two fiscal years. (Chap. 73, 1963).

It should also be noted that S.D.C. 15.2246, which is South Dakota's basic foundation of support, places restrictions on which districts can actually receive this support. Each district must have operated one or more schools during the previous school year, none of which is a one teacher rural elementary school with an ADM of 5 or fewer, and located within five miles of another operating school, and no secondary school of fewer than 35 pupils in ADM shall have been operated within twenty miles of another secondary school. Schools must employ qualified

teachers and be accredited.

In 1951-52 South Dakota had 3,390 school districts. By the fall of 1968 this number had decreased to 1204. Although the state's basic reorganization legislation has been of a permissive nature, the 1967 law and restrictions placed on the foundation program are effecting a decrease in the number of school districts.

Tennessee

Within the period of this study there were three legislative acts directed toward the reorganization of the Tennessee school districts. All three of these acts were in the form of permissive legislation.

The first was enacted in 1947. It allowed the transfer of city, town, or special school districts to the county system. Action was to be initiated by either municipal officers or by the school boards. Transfer would be allowed upon a referendum of the voters favoring such transfer.

The second act, passed in 1957, permitted the school systems to form "joint operated" schools by contract between two or more existing systems. Procedure was established for operating and administering such schools.

The third legislative effort came six years later (1963). This act provided for the creation of "unification educational planning commissions" for the "consolidation of all the public schools within a county into a unified school system." The act details the formation and organization of such county commissions and sets forth a plan for the consolidation of the schools. Consolidation is contingent upon the approval of the majority of voters in each school area affected by the reorganization.

In 1943-44 Tennessee had 156 school districts. By the fall of 1968 this figure had been reduced to 150.

Texas

In 1943-44 the state of Texas had 6,132 school districts. By the fall of 1968 this number had been reduced to a figure of 1,231.

In 1947 legislation was passed authorizing the annexation of any common or independent school to any contiguous independent district. (Acts 1947, 50 Leg., Ch. 259, Art. 28036). This law prescribed the duties of a County Board of Trustees, provided for the calling of elections, and set forth guidelines for debt assumption. Title to all property was to be vested in the receiving district which was to assume all outstanding indebtedness. Any tax of the receiving district was to continue and become effective in the territory annexed.

In 1949 the legislature clarified questions concerning the validity of newly created or reorganized school districts. (Acts of 1949, 51st Leg. Ch. 477-449). Chapter 518, Art 2805a, enabled the County Board of School Trustees to call an election by the voters for the levying of taxes in any case where existing laws permitted annexation or consolidation, and such laws did not expressly authorize trustees to call an election. Chapter 90, Art. 2806d, validated the consolidation of one or more common school districts with one or more independent school districts after a duly constituted election.

In 1953 the 53rd Leg. in Ch. 32, par. 1, Art 2804a, provided that the annexation of territory or enlargement of any city within any county having

a population of 165,000 shall not have the effect of adding any territory to any school district; providing that after such annexation, territory may be detached from the school district and annexed to any contiguous school district, upon approval of a majority of School Trustees of each school district affected.

In 1961 legislation was enacted providing for incentive aid payments to Independent School Districts created through consolidation (Acts 1961, 57th Leg., Ch. 260, Art. 2815-3). The amount of aid shall not exceed the difference between the sum of the Foundation Aid that the included districts would have been paid had there been no consolidation, and the amount of Foundation Aid for which the new district qualifies. The new district shall not contain fewer than 1,000 children in ADA. The incentive aid payment shall be used exclusively to retire existing bonded indebtedness or shall be applied to the cost of construction of new buildings. The aid payments shall be reduced in direct proportion to any reduction in ADA. The geographical limits of the consolidated district shall be submitted to the Texas Education Agency for approval. The consolidation shall result in the formation of an independent school district.

In 1963 the above act was amended to change the minimum number of students in ADA from 1,000 to 750. (Acts 1963, 58th Leg., Ch. 361, Art. 2815-4).

The 1965 legislature again amended the 1961 Act to state that where newly organized districts are budget balanced (not eligible for Foundation Aid), the amount of the incentive aid payment shall not exceed the sum of Foundation Aid for which the several districts in the new district were eligible. Where there have been or hereafter will be one, or a series of consolidations, the lastly created consolidated district shall be eligible to receive incentive aid payments as computed separately at the time of consolidations. A ten year payment is involved which is computed from the date of consolidation, or from the effective date of the amendatory Act, whichever is the latest.

Utah

Two catagories of Utah public schools were established by the state's constitution and one by statute: county schools, schools in cities of the first class, and schools in cities of the second class. Article X, section 6, of the Utah State Constitution sets the classification system; "In cities of the first and second class, the public school system shall be controlled by the board of education of such cities, separate and apart from the counties in which said cities are located." USA 53-4-1 makes each county a district except where more than one district existed in a county before 1943. USA 53-4-4 declares each first and second class city boundary to be one school district. USA 53-4-5 prohibits county officers from amending any city's board of education tax levy. USA 10-1-1 sets the classification of cities and towns by population:

First class	100,000 plus
Second class	60,000 - 99,999
Third class	800 - 59,999
Town .	1 - 799

This 1943 legislation also allowed cities to annex county territory. The transfer of county schools into city school systems of the first and second class could be affected when this annexation took place. (USA 53-4-10).

It appears that no major consolidation or decentralization laws have been passed since 1943. In 1944 Utah had 40 school districts, a figure they have maintained to this day.

Vermont

There had been little change in Vermont's school district organizational structure from 1948 when there were 268 school districts to the fall of 1968 when there were 250. Permissive reorganization legislation was in effect over this period of time with the only major changes coming in 1958 when the legislature established five separate school district classifications: Supervisory Unions, Town School Districts, Incorporated School Districts, Union School Districts, and Interstate Compacts (USA 1958, Title 16). Under the acting legislation the state provided for guidelines under which the above types of school districts could merge, but such mergers were left to the discretion of the local school boards. An exception to this policy was U.S.A. No. 261, "Organization and Adjustment of Supervisory Unions." Under the limitations of this provision, the state board of education was directed to combine small school districts into supervisional unions of approximately fifty teachers each. This was to be done as soon as possible without any specified time limits applied.

On March 12, 1966, the Vermont Legislature approved U.S.A. 66, Ch. 9, Art. 1. General Provisions, Section 1, Statement of Policy: "It is the policy of the state of Vermont to encourage and promote the inclusion of the entire state of Vermont into reorganized school districts encompassing grades K-12 under the Union School District Laws in order to make available a diversified education program of high quality with maximum of local control." Sections 2-4 of this legislation provided that an Advisory Commission be organized which was to "conduct studies relevant to the reorganization of school districts, confer with local school officials and study groups on these matters and recommend to the Legislature and state board of education proposed school districts, kindergarten through grade 12." This report was to be delivered on or before February 1, 1967. The purpose of this report was to serve as a state reorganization plan, under which local districts were given the option of either accepting it in tote, or else preparing a counter proposal for a reorganized school district, kindergarten through grade 12, either as a Union High School District, Union Elementary District, K-12 Union District, a modified or enlarged Supervisory Union, or a combination of the above. The boards of school directors included in each of the state's study areas were also instructed to submit surveys of the educational needs of each area. These include provisions for voter approval, election of single boards of education, disposition, ownership, and utilization of school property, bonded indebtedness, adequate staff, and a financing plan for the proposed district. Lastly, it must include a recommended date for local vote provided the proposal is acceptable. This information was requested to be submitted to the Advisory Commission not later than July 1, 1967; however, a deferment of not more than six months was to be given to those requesting additional time.

Virginia

The organization of Virginia School Districts was accomplished in the year 1922. At that time the existing school districts were enlarged so as to make the Virginia school system a county system. Since 1922 school boundaries have remained very stable, with adjustment to a few individual districts being the only changes.

The statutes which brought about the formation of a county system are listed here:

Section 22-30. School Division - how division made.
The state board shall divide the state into appropriate school divisions, at the discretion of the board, comprising not less than one county or city each, but no county or city shall be divided in the formation of such division. Approved, 1922, amended 1928, 1936, 1942.

Section 22-42. School Districts - counties and magisterial districts as school districts.
Each magisterial district shall, except where otherwise provided by law, constitute a separate school district for the purpose of representation. For all other school purposes, including taxation, management, control and operation, unless otherwise provided by law, the county shall be the unit; and the school affairs of each county shall be managed as if the county constituted but one school district provided, however, that nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the levying of a district tax in any district or districts sufficient to pay any indebtedness of whatsoever kind, including the interest thereon, heretofore or hereafter incurred by or on behalf of any district or districts for school purposes. Approved 1942. Amended 1944, 1948, and 1962.

Attention has been given to establishing consolidated schools of sufficient size to offer comprehensive education programs at reasonable per-capita cost. Improved highways and aid to local school divisions in meeting the cost of pupil transportation have helped to reduce the number of schools within the counties of Virginia from 4,055 in 1948 to 1,846 in 1968.

Washington

Washington's school district reorganization grew out of a series of studies and surveys conducted during the late 1930's resulting in the development of widespread recognition of the need for improving the school district system. The first major reorganization legislation was enacted in 1941, establishing a pattern of redistricting procedures which have been successfully used in other state programs started since that time.

The state board of education was to appoint a nine member State Reorganization Committee which was to have as its major functions: 1) employment of a director and needed personnel to enable the committee to carry out its powers and to assist county committees; 2) furnish county committees with plans of procedure, standards, maps, and forms; 3) approval of reorganization proposals submitted by county committees; and if reorganization plans were disapproved, to assist in preparing a revised plan; and 4) appointment of a county committee in any county where none had been established within the specified time limit, or where any committee had failed to exercise its assigned responsibilities.

County committees were to prepare comprehensive reorganization plans and submit them to the state committees. Any proposed reorganization which included territory in more than one county was to be prepared by joint action of a special committee composed of at least three members from each county committee concerned. In preparing these plans consideration was to be given to the educational needs of local communities, to equalizing local burdens of school support, to economies

in transportation and administration costs, to future use of existing school plans, to the convenience and welfare of pupils, and to equalizing their educational opportunities.

A public hearing had to be held on any proposal for forming a new district or for transferring any district territory in which children of school age resided. Provision was also made for hearing testimony for the purpose of determining the amount of assets and liabilities of the districts involved in the proposal.

School district boundaries could not be changed by means of the consolidation and annexation laws without the approval of both the county and state board of education.

By 1945, when the legislation expired, the number of districts had been reduced by more than three-fifths. (1,792 districts in 1931-32 to 838 during the year 1943-44).

For two years after the expiration of the 1941 act, the state had no reorganization legislation except the old consolidation laws. In 1947 new legislation setting forth the current legal bases for the formation and establishment of new school districts and the alteration of existing districts was passed. The new statutes had as their purpose the goal of providing the state with an integrated system of agencies for acquiring, constructing, financing, administering, supervising, maintaining, and operating the public schools.

The main statutes affecting reorganization were:

1. 28.57.030 Created county committees - composition, terms vacancies, compensation
2. 28.57.040 Organization and meeting guidelines
3. 28.57.050 Powers and duties of county committees
4. 28.57.060 Powers and duties of the state board
5. 28.57.160 Reorganization of districts by transfer of territory
6. 28.57.170, 28.57.180, 28.57.190, and 28.57.200 are all supporting statutes which cover procedures for bringing about reorganization through: petition; transfer of territory; annexation; and dissolution and annexation of depopulated area.

Election procedures were established. In 1957 the procedures were changed to require a favorable majority of all votes cast in the election, with the entire area voting as a unit, for adopting the proposed reorganization. The county committee could revise any proposal defeated by the voters and if the revision was approved by the state committee, it could then be voted on.

In 1959 a new enactment specifically dealt with the transfer, annexation of territory to or from union high school districts. (28.57.335) Transfer or annexation of all or part of a union high school district to an existing or newly created district was provided as long as no union high school district shall contain less than the whole territory of any school district and every union high school district must contain the whole territory of at least two or more school districts.

By the fall of 1968 the number of school districts in Washington had been reduced to 337 although there has been basically no change in the 1947 legislation.

In 1969 the 1st Extraordinary Session passed legislation permitting the state board of education to make capital construction grants to districts which reorganize into acceptable administrative units.

West Virginia

The major thrust toward school district reorganization in West Virginia occurred between 1932 and 1943, as evidenced by the deletion of total school districts in that state from 450 to 55 during this period.

Until 1933, West Virginia maintained a trichotomous division of school districts listed as magisterial districts, magisterial subdistricts, and independent districts. At this time, the West Virginia Legislature enacted legislation designed to consolidate and unify school districts by counties. This legislative action became West Virginia Code 18-1-3 titled Scope of School District; abolition of magisterial school districts, etc., and independent districts. The act reads as follows:

> "A school district shall include all the territory in one county. Existing magisterial school districts and subdistricts and independent districts are abolished." Effect of Amendment of 1933.

Other sections of this act relating to reorganization are as follows:

> (18-5-11; 18-5-13) "The boards of two or more adjoining counties may jointly establish and maintain schools....
> The boards of the several districts shall determine the site of the proposed school and the amount to be expended for its establishment and equipment....
> The annual operating cost shall be apportioned among the districts on the basis of the ADA of pupils from each district."
>
> "The boards, subject to the provisions of this chapter and the rules and regulations of the state board, shall have authority:
>
> 1. To control and manage all the schools and school interests of the county ....
> 2. To establish needed high schools.
> 3. To close any school which is unnecessary....
> 4. To consolidate schools.
> 5. To close any elementary school with an enrollment below 20 pupils....
> 6. To provide at public expense an adequate means of transportation....
> 7. To provide at public expense insurance against negligence.."

In summary it may be stated that the sum total of the reorganization legislation for West Virginia was generated from the 1933 enactment changing all existing districts to a county system of organization. Fifty-five school districts exist which is the same number of counties in the state.

Wisconsin

The basis for school district organization and reorganization is found in the state constitution. Article X, Section 3, specifies: "The legislature shall provide by law for the establishment of district schools which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable." This provision places with the legislature the authority to create, dissolve, alter and consolidate school districts either directly or through agencies established for that purpose. In 1943-44 Wisconsin had 6,400 school districts. By the fall of 1969 this number had been reduced to 457.

After studies by educators in the 1930's, the 1945 legislature established a committee to study and to recommend proposals for the improvement of education in the state. In 1947 legislation was enacted which created a county school committee in each of the state's seventy-one counties for the purpose of making reorganization plans and empowering them to establish larger school administrative units. Either upon a petition by a county elector or upon its own motion, the county committee was empowered to issue orders creating, dissolving or attaching school districts in accordance with the classification system set forth in the statutes. An appeal procedure was also provided for. When any proposed reorganization contained territory in two or more counties, the committees of the counties involved were to function as a joint committee. The State Superintendent was directed to advise and consult with county school committees. He was also empowered to make appropriate recommendations. (These provisions are found in the Laws of 1947, Chap. 40.)

The 1949 amendments provided for county committees to file with the State Superintendent by July 1, 1951 comprehensive county plans for the establishment of administrative units which would include grades K-12 or 1-12. Orders for reorganization issued by county committees were made subject to referendum. Approval of the county committees' orders required a favorable majority vote both in the incorporated centers and in the open-county-territory of the proposed reorganization. In all cases where the referendum vote was unfavorable, the county school committee was to continue its work so long as the need for reorganization existed, but its orders were always subject to referendum. (Laws of 1949, Chap. 40).

The 1949 legislature also set forth the major features of the State School Finance Plan which have basically held true since this time. A key feature in the program is a provision rewarding Integrated Aid districts more favorably than Basic Aid Districts (Laws of 1949, Chap. 402, set for present payment plan.) Those districts meeting minimum state standards are classified as basic aid districts. Those districts meeting specified additional standards are classified as integrated aid districts. Since the passage of this aid program in 1949, over sixty Union High School Districts (maintaining programs for only grades 9-12) have disappeared.

Two other methods of school district reorganization were available as follows: A) 40.07 - Consolidation of Common School Districts by Referendum (New Code - 117.06). This act enabled 10% of the electors in each of two or more school districts to petition for consolidation. An election was to be held and if a majority of voters were in favor, a consolidation was effected. The assets and liabilities of the several districts before consolidation, were to become the responsibility of the newly created district. B) 40.06 and/or 40.06(3) - Authorized the municipal board (town, village or city) to reorganize school districts. Persons aggrieved by such order could appeal to the State Superintendent of schools. Reorganization

orders issued by the municipal board or the state superintendent were subject to referendum approval on the same basis as those issued by the county school committee.

In 1953 the state legislature passed a statute which assisted district reorganization. 40.08 - Dissolution of Districts by Neglect to Keep School (New Code - 117.09). This act stated that if a district for two or more successive years neglects to operate a school for its children as required by law, it shall be attached to a new school district by referendum or by an agency school committee.

In 1959 legislation included the passage of 40.035 (New Code 117.01). This act stated that any territory which is not included in a district which operates a high school on July 1, 1962 shall be attached to, created into, or consolidated with a district operating a high school by order of the agency school committee not later than July 1, 1962. This act was repealed by the 1965 legislature because the purpose had been accomplished and the principle was incorporated in Chapter 117.01(e).

Chapter 117.01(e) of the newly coded revision provides that all territory in the state shall be included in a school district operating elementary school grades and a school district operating high school grades or in a school district operating both elementary and high school grades. No common school district may be created having less than $150,000 of assessed valuation.

Chapter 40.95 (New Code 117.04) also passed originally in 1959, provides for the creation of Unified School Districts in any territory containing 1,000 or more electors which established a new form of school district government enabling fiscally dependent districts with Second and third class cities to change to a fiscally independent type of district.

Agency School Committees were created in 1966 by the enactment of Chapter 388, Laws of 1965. The new law abolished the county school committees and removed from the municipal boards (40.06) and the State Superintendent (40.06(3)) the authority to reorganize school districts. It created an agency school committee with power to reorganize school districts in each of the nineteen cooperative educational service agencies subject to the same referendum provision that applied to orders issued by the former county school committees. This law also made such orders subject to appeal by any aggrieved persons to the state appeal board which is composed of the State Superintendent (chairman) and presidents of four agency school committees not involved in the appeal. Furthermore, the state appeal board orders are subject to a referendum provision and/or to court review when certain conditions prevail. In addition, the agency school committee is required to formulate a long range plan to operate a comprehensive school program of offerings and services which meet the present and future educable needs of children and which can function with efficiency and economy.

Wyoming

Within the period of this study there have been two major pieces of legislation enacted by the Wyoming legislature regarding school district reorganization. The 1957 School District reorganization act provided for a broad reorganization (mainly within counties) to be carried out by a state planning committee acting through elected county committees. The second major effort has come out of the 1969 legislature and in many of its details looks much like the 1957 version. There is a fundamental difference, however, in that the new version does not provide

D

an opportunity for the voters to block reorganization. If the county does not appoint a county planning committee by a specified date, the state committee must make these appointments. If the committees do not submit approved plans by a specified date, the state committee will proceed with the reorganization. The establishment of the new unified school district is made by action of the state committee, not the voters.

In 1948 there were 356 school districts in the state. In the fall of 1968 this number had been reduced to 164. With the 1969 reorganization legislation this figure will reduce itself even more significantly by January 20, 1972.

The following remarks are in reference to the 1957 reorganization act and are taken from Volume 6 of Wyoming Statutes (1957), Title 21 (Education), Chapter 3 (School Districts), Article 5 (Reorganization), pages 290.382.

The purpose of the act was to equalize opportunity, promote uniformity of tax rates, and to bring about wiser use of public funds. A state committee was to be appointed by the state board of education and was to include the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and eight representative citizens of the state. They were to serve a four year term without pay. The powers of the State Committee are to appoint needed personnel, govern disbursement of funds, aid county committees, receive, examine and file reorganization plans, appoint county committees if not elected, keep county superintendents informed, modify county plans when needed and resubmit to county committees for approval, advise boards of trustees in new districts, report to each session of the legislature and recommend legislation which appears needed. County committees are to be elected by electors from each school district in the county and the county superintendent of schools. These committees were to consist of eight members but not more than three professional educators. The powers and duties of County Committees are to prepare a comprehensive plan of county reorganization by January 1, 1962. The law also included a plan for reorganized districts involving two or more counties. Due consideration is to be given to a number of factors including the reduction of evaluation disparities and equalization of educational opportunity. The County Committee also details the procedure for public hearings on county plans set forth.

The new district is to be established by a special election. If one school district, within the proposed reorganized district, has a majority of the votes, the new district cannot be approved by the most populous district unless it is also approved in the area outside of that most populous district as well.

The county may revise a plan rejected by the voters and a new election may be called by the county superintendent if the plan is approved by the state committee. The newly created districts must operate at least one high school or one elementary school.

Wyoming School District Reorganization Law of 1969 (chapter six of the school code), revises the 1957 code in this manner. The purpose of the act is to improve and equalize educational opportunity, to provide for wiser and more efficient use of funds by making it possible to reduce the disparity in per pupil evaluation among the school districts. The law's provisions are to allow initial planning to be done at the local level, to enlarge the school districts of the state, and to eliminate the different kinds of school districts and substitute "unified school districts."

The basic plan of organization involves putting all of the counties in one

or more unified school districts on or before January 20, 1972. Requirements for unified school districts are that it must be organized as an efficient administrative unit, considering primarily the education, convenience, and welfare of children. All of the state must be organized into USD except the Wind River Indian Reservation, and the territory of each USD shall be contiguous. Consideration must be given for equalization of per pupil assessed valuation "among districts in various counties", trustee residence areas must be established within each USD giving consideration to school population, general population, and ecology, and there must be provisions for educational opportunity and service as nearly equal as possible in all areas of each USD.

The state committee is to consist of the state superintendent of public instruction and the state board of education. The power and authority of the state committee is to appoint necessary personnel, to govern disbursements of funds for carrying out the provisions of this chapter, to aid the county committee in carrying out their duties, to receive, file and consider plans for organization of USD, "to appoint by May 1, 1969, a county committee in any county in which no county committee is elected as required by this chapter", to make recommendations for modifications to the county committee USD plans, and "to review all plans of organization submitted to it and either approve such plans or reject them with reasons for such rejection and recommendations for making the plan acceptable. ---The state committee shall reject a plan of organization only if it fails to comply with the provisions of this chapter. If a plan is rejected, a county committee may resubmit a modified plan as often as necessary. When a plan of organization becomes an approved plan, the state committee shall make a order establishing the unified school district according to the approved plan of organization; said order shall be the final administrative determination---. The order providing for the establishment of the unified district shall become effective and binding ten (10) days after it is so filed." (with the county clerk)

The law authorized the state committee to reorganize any territory not included in an approved plan of reorganization and to provide for trustees for such unified districts as may be so established.

County committees, selected by April 1, 1969 are required to submit a plan of organization by January 1, 1971, hold public hearings within the county. Committees are required to advise and cooperate with committees in adjoining counties, and equitable allocation of assets and debts of affected districts must be made.

The law requires that the plan of organization include a date for initial election of a board of trustees for the proposed USD, and that such an election is to be prior to January 10, 1972. It also provides for appeal of the decision of the state committee by any citizen or taxpayer of the territory involved, and prevents bond issues by existing Elementary school districts without approval of county state committees, and provides additional state aids for any USD whose total fiscal resources have been reduced by reorganization.

Footnotes

[1]Subcommittee of the Committee for the White House Conference on Education "In What Ways Can We Organize Our Schools More Efficiently and Economically?" A Statistical Survey of School District Reorganization In the United States, 1954-55, (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1955), p. 1

[2]Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw - Hill Book Co. 1959), p. 182.

CHAPTER III

THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT

The NEFP special project on "School District Reorganization and the Distribution of State Aids" encompasses a twenty-year longitudinal study of the intermediate unit. The definition of the intermediate unit used for this study is the one used by the United States Office of Education. This definition is:

> "A unit smaller than the state which exists primarily to provide consultative, advisory, or statistical services to local basic administrative units or to exercise certain regulatory and inspectoral functions over local basic administrative units. An intermediate unit may operate schools and contract for school services, but it does not exist primarily to render such services. Such units may or may not have taxing power."[1]

Although many definitions have been used by numerous writers in the field this definitiion used by the U. S. Office of Education seems to describe the middle echelon of school administration that existed prior to World War II and also the evolving unit of the present.

History of the Intermediate Unit Prior to World War II

The original structure of the intermediate unit was basically the office of the county superintendent of schools. That office was created across the nation to assist state education officials in the operation of a system of schools primarily concerned with instruction on the elementary level. The county level of government seemed a logical level for the administration of this state function. It became the connecting link between the state and the local school districts. In some states the township was the first intermediate level of school administration. In this period of our nation's development the intermediate unit served a dual purpose. It enabled the state to encourage local communities to provide an elementary education for all children that took into account desirable state-wide standards. It also enabled the local school districts to control and support their schools as a function of government on the local level.

As cities developed extensive school programs through the secondary level, they were excluded from the immediate concern of the intermediate unit from state to state. In many southern states the county unit became the local unit of school administration and incorporated into one unit the local level and the intermediate level of school administration.

After World War II two patterns of concern emerged on the educational horizon. One was an expanded interest in developing secondary education for all of America's youth. The other was a concern that many existing local school units were not capable of providing the type of education needed at the elementary level. Both of these concerns directly affected the intermediate unit of school administration.

After World War II the forty-eight states had the following types of intermediate units of school administration:

1. Twenty-eight states used the county as the intermediate unit.
2. One state, New York, used both the supervisory union and the board of cooperative educational services as intermediate units.
3. The six New England states used the supervisory union as a quasi-intermediate unit.
4. Thirteen states did not have an intermediate unit because they used the county and individual cities as the local units of school administration.

The Emerging Intermediate Unit

With the reduction in the number of local school districts and the efforts to provide secondary education the intermediate unit had to change. The intermediate unit concerned primarily with elementary school districts was no longer needed. The future of the intermediate unit provided two choices. It could cease to exist when the elementary school districts were discontinued or it could serve the current needs of elementary and secondary education in the new pattern of local school districts.

The future of the intermediate unit was studied, discussed and in some cases changed by legislation. The legislative and professional study commissions in the respective states, the study commissions of national professional associations, the doctoral dissertations and recently the Title III planning activities concerned with a new framework for intermediate units are legion. One change for the intermediate unit is common to all of these. That change is a transition from the regulatory function to the service function of intermediate units. Coupled with this change is a restructuring of the boundaries of the intermediate units to reflect the socio-economic areas that exist irrespective of county lines. The greatly reduced number of local school districts makes direct contact between the states and the local districts feasible for the needed regulatory and data gathering functions of the state. The list of educational services provided through intermediate units today goes far beyond the imagination of the men who created the intermediate unit in the early history of educational development in the nation.

Current Status of the Intermediate Unit

The service function has reshaped the intermediate unit. The states that have not shifted to this idea have seen the intermediate unit drop out of a significant place in the educational structure in their state. In 1969 the pattern of the intermediate unit organization was as follows:

1. Nineteen states used the county as the intermediate unit. Four of these states (Colorado, Iowa, Nebraska and Texas were in a transitional phase where the counties were being replaced with area intermediate units.
2. Eleven states used an area approach for a service-oriented unit.
3. Six states used supervisory unions as quasi-intermediate units.
4. Nineteen states did not have any legally created intermediate units.

A description of the services performed by intermediate units and the means of support for current intermediate units is incorporated in another part of this report.

TABLE 3-I
THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT AS A
SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

	1949					1969					
	County Unit	Area Unit	Supervisory Unions	None		County Unit	Area Unit	Supervisory Unions	None		Year Legislation Authorized Area Units
Alabama				X					X		
Alaska									X		
Arizona	X					X					
Arkansas	X					X					①
California	X					X					
Colorado	X					X	X				1967
Connecticut			X					X			
Delaware				X					X		
Florida				X					X		
Georgia				X					X		
Hawaii									X		
Idaho	X								X		
Illinois	X					X					1969 ②
Indiana	X					X					
Iowa	X					X	X				1957
Kansas	X								X		③
Kentucky				X					X		
Louisiana				X					X		
Maine			X					X			
Maryland				X					X		
Massachusetts			X					X			
Michigan	X						X				1962
Minnesota	X					X					1969 ④
Mississippi	X					X					
Missouri	X					X					
Montana	X					X					
Nebraska	X					X	X				1967
Nevada	X								X		
New Hampshire			X					X			
New Jersey	X					X					
New Mexico				X					X		
New York		X	X				X	X			1948
North Carolina				X					X		
North Dakota	X					X					⑤
Ohio	X					X					⑥
Oklahoma	X					X					
Oregon	X						X				1967
Pennsylvania	X						X				1969
Rhode Island			X						X		
South Carolina	X					X					
South Dakota	X					X					
Tennessee				X					X		
Texas	X					X	X				1965

Table 3-1 continued.

	1949					1969					
	County Unit	Area Unit	Super-visory Unions	None		County Unit	Area Unit	Super-visory Unions	None		Year Legislation Authorized Area Units
Utah				X					X		(7)
Vermont			X					X			
Virginia				X					X		
Washington	X						X				1965
West Virginia				X					X		
Wisconsin	X						X				1965
Wyoming	X						X				1969 (8)
Totals	28	1	7	13		19	11	6	19		

NOTES:

1. As of August 7, 1969, the county board of education is authorized to hire a secretary in lieu of a county school supervisor.
2. Legislation in 1969 changed the office of county superintendent to superintendent of educational service region. By 1973 all territory is to be part of those regions. The size of the regions will be determined by a stipulated minimum population.
3. As of July, 1969, the office of county superintendent was terminated in all counties with the record keeping function being transferred to the offices of the county register of deeds.
4. As of December 31, 1970, the elective office of county superintendent will cease to exist. County boards of commissioners may appoint a county superintendent to serve for any period of time until December 31, 1972, after which the office of county superintendent will terminate in the state of Minnesota.
5. Legislation in 1967 authorized two counties to jointly employ one superintendent.
6. A joint legislative commission was authorized to draft a legislative proposal for the establishment of education resource centers that would be given consideration by the Ohio General Assembly during 1970.
7. Legislation in 1969 authorized $175,000 for research and innovation which would include the development of regional service centers.
8. Legislation in 1969 abolished the office of county superintendent and permitted any combination of districts to cooperate to provide educational services.

TABLE B-II

The Current Status of the
Intermediate Unit in the States
Using this Organizational Structure

	Counties as units of civil gov.	Counties as Intermediate school units	Area Intermediate school units	Designation of intermediate area units
Arizona	14	14		
Arkansas	75	73		
California	58	58**		
Colorado	63	17	16	Boards of Cooperative services
Connecticut*	8		11	Supervisory union
Illinois	102	102	Initiated 1969	Educational service region
Indiana	92	16		
Iowa	99	31	27	Joint county systems
Kansas	105	0		
Maine*	16		85	Supervisory union
Massachusetts*	14		54	Supervisory union
Michigan	83		60	Intermediate unit
Minnesota	87	33		
Mississippi	82	11		
Missouri	114	34		
Montana	56	56		
Nebraska	93	91	19	Educational service unit
New Hampshire*	10		42	Supervisory union
New Jersey	21	21		
New York	62		70	Supervisory districts
			56	BOCES
North Dakota	53	53		
Ohio	88	88		
Oklahoma	77	77		
Oregon	36		14	Intermediate education district
Pennsylvania	67		29	Intermediate unit
South Carolina	46	16		
South Dakota	67	64		
Texas	254	202	20	Regional media and service centers
Vermont*	14		46	Supervisory union
Washington	39		6	Intermediate districts
Wisconsin	72		19	Cooperative educational service agency
Wyoming	23		Initiated 1969	Boards of cooperative educational services

*It is debatable whether these states should be classified as states with intermediate units.

**California has six counties in this total of fifty-eight that also serve as the local district unit.

PROFILE OF REGIONAL AND INTERMEDIATE UNITS

For the purposes of this study the definition of intermediate units will be the one used by the United States Office of Education in its biennial surveys of education. These surveys are entitled, STATISTICS OF STATE SCHOOL SYSTEMS: ORGANIZATION, STAFF, PUPILS AND FINANCES.

> "Intermediate units for public school administration, operating between the state and the local level, include counties, parts of counties (multiple county units) and supervisory unions. The main responsibility of intermediate units has been not the operation of schools but the rendering of consultative, advisory and statistical services, and the exercise of regulatory and inspectorial functions."

According to the literature searched on intermediate units and confirmed by the respective state departments of education in their responses to a questionnaire designed for this project, the following states do not have intermediate units in their public school organization:

1. Alabama
2. Delaware
3. Florida
4. Georgia
5. Idaho
6. Kentucky
7. Louisiana
8. Maryland
9. Nevada
10. New Mexico
11. North Carolina
12. Rhode Island
13. Tennessee
14. Utah
15. Virginia
16. West Virginia

Arizona

1. Existing Units

Number There are fourteen county units that serve as intermediate units.

Type The county units serve as a weak regulatory arm of the state. Their main function in this area is to see that the state courses of study are being used in local districts and that the state regulations regarding textbooks are being observed. The county superintendent is primarily a clinical manager for the schools in each county. The most important functions of his office are the details of finance. School funds are apportioned through this office in accordance with the budgetary and apportionment standards for the various school districts. Vouchers for claims and salaries are paid by his warrant drawn on the county treasurer and charged to the appropriate school fund. From this accounting function his office supplies financial data to the state department of education.

Size The typical county serving as an intermediate unit is approximately 8,000 square miles.

Expenditures The cost of maintaining this office is an obligation of the county board of supervisors in each respective county. For 1968-69 the Annual Report of the Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction (p. 90-91) reports a total expenditure of $676,000 for these fourteen county units.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The office of the county superintendent of schools was authorized in the State Constitution, Article 11, Section 2, in 1910. The powers and duties of the office were included in the State Constitution, Article 12, Section 4, in 1910. Revisions of the office were made in 1912, 1913, 1927, 1928, 1939, and 1947.

Levy Authority The office of the county superintendent has no authority to levy taxes. All levies for education on the county level must be made by the county board of supervisors.

State Aid The county as an intermediate unit does not qualify for any state aids. It does, however, receive 1% of all federal funds paid to local districts to cover the administration and accounting costs of the county office for these added special programs.

Relationship to Districts The county as an intermediate unit assists local districts in meeting the requirements of operation, program and reporting as established by the state.

3. Program

Services Besides the accounting services described above the office of the county superintendent keep a current file of certificates and health examinations for all teachers in the county. In counties with unorganized territory the county superintendent does administer the accommodation schools and the required transportation. In a few counties the county superintendent also administers the needed programs for "homebound" children.

Arkansas

1. Existing Units

Number There are seventy-three counties which function as intermediate units. The other two counties operate as local districts under permissive legislation of 1967.

Type The county units serve as a regulatory arm of the state. Their main functions are to maintain standards in schools and collect data for the state department of education.

Size The typical county serving as an intermediate unit is approximately 700 square miles.

Expenditures The expenditures for these units are made from the general county funds. For the 1965-66 school year the USOE reported total expenditures of $731,000 for the seventy-three intermediate units.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory In 1919 county boards of education were created to replace county courts as the supervising agency for schools in each county. This basic law was revised in 1941, 1949, 1953, 1957, 1967 and 1969. The 1941 law excluded schools who employed their own superintendent.

Levy Authority The intermediate unit does not have any authority to levy taxes. The costs of the units are paid from general county funds.

State Aid Part of the cost of the salary of the county supervisor of schools is paid by the state. This is paid as a flat-grant. The 1969 law (Act 499, Sec. 9) establishes this grant as the average teacher salary in the state for a recent year. Opportunity school aid is the only other aid paid by the state.

Relationship to Districts The intermediate unit supervises local districts under its jurisdiction. It supervises elections in local districts and approves budgets for local districts. It has the power to change districts and transfer pupils from school to school. It also is responsible for administering the compulsory attendance law.

3. Program

Services In a limited number of cases the county office administers the free textbook program for the schools of the county. It is also authorized to conduct opportunity school classes for illiterate adults.

California

1. Existing Units

Number There are fifty-two intermediate units in the state providing services and coordination for the local districts within their boundaries. Six counties are unified districts, which means they operate as a school district with a superintendent and governing board, which also serves as the County Board of Education. These six counties are Alpine, Del Morte, Mariposa, Plumas, San Francisco and Sierra.

Type The county units function primarily as service and coordination agencies for local districts. They do perform a limited number of ministerial duties required by the state.

Size The California counties are large. As an example the San Bernadina county covers as much territory (over 20,000 square miles) as Connecticut, Massachusetts and New Jersey combined. The median sized county in the state is approximately 1500 square miles.

Expenditures During 1965-66 the fifty-two intermediate units spent $47,346,916 for salaries, travel and other expenses. This represents slightly more than two percent of the amount spent by local districts that year.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The county superintendency was created as an office in the state Constitution of 1849. The laws of 1921, 1929, 1931, 1947 and 1955 all extended the services. The county office was authorized to provide for local districts.

Levy Authority The county superintendent is a county office and thus part of its support comes from a levy made by the county board. For certain specific functions the county board of education may levy up to a specified amount.

State Aid In the laws that have charged the office of the county superintendent with the specialized functions the state has provided for special state aids. The aids are claimed directly from the state based on actual budget reports from the office of the county superintendent.

Relationship to Districts The county as an intermediate unit in California is service oriented. It provides assistance in areas where local districts are too small to economically provide a needed education service. The intermediate unit is authorized to provide direct services to districts of less than 901 if elementary, 301 if high school, and 1501 if unified. It is authorized to operate certain special schools and programs. These activities may involve as high as 5000 students in a county. The county superintendent is also authorized to provide a coordinating service for all districts under his jurisdiction. Many of these services involve contractual agreements between two or more local districts. The renewal of the contracts provides a continual re-education of the need and results of the specialized programs.

3. Program

Services The services provided are numerous. Basically they are curriculum, special or business services. Examples are: 1) Los Angeles county operates five schools for handicapped children, 2) San Diego county operates a car pool of autos and trucks as well as a mobile industrial arts shop, 3) O[illegible]ispo county provides the services of supervisors in curriculum fields as well as a dental hygienist and a probation liaison person.

Colorado

1. Existing Units

Number There were sixty-three county units operating as intermediate units in 1966. Permissive legislation was passed in 1967 enabling counties to vote on the termination of the office of county superintendent. This was part of the legislation which authorized local districts to voluntarily form boards of cooperative services. As of October, 1969, the office of the county superintendent was terminated in forty-three counties and sixteen voluntary boards of cooperative services had been formed.

Type The county units were primarily regulatory arms of the state. The newly formed boards of cooperative services are extensions of the local districts with providing services their primary responsibility.

Size The county units were each approximately 1600 square miles in area. The boards of cooperative services are approximately three times as large.

Expenditures In 1965-66 the United States Office of Education reported a total expenditure of $396,000 for the sixty-three county units. The recently formed boards of cooperative services dealt with contracts between various combinations of districts. This makes any tabulation of expenditures for the new units extremely difficult and of questionable accuracy.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The office of county superintendent was provided for in Article XIV, Sec. 8, of the Colorado State Constitution in 1876. The duties of the office were revised in 1883, 1887, 1908, and 1953. The 1967 legislation authorized elections in counties to abolish the office.

Levy Authority Taxes for the support of the county superintendent's office in the twenty counties are levied by the county commissioners. The boards of cooperative services do not have any authority to levy taxes. All revenues for their activities must come from the local districts or from special grants.

State Aid No state aid is paid to the county units nor to the newly formed boards of cooperative services for the administrative functions. State aid may be claimed by the boards of cooperative services for programs that qualify for special state aids. These aids may be claimed by the respective local districts or the board of cooperative services.

3. Program

Services The county units do not provide any specialized services for the local districts. The newly formed boards of cooperative services coordinate a wide variety of special educational services. These range from accounting to zoological field trips and include curriculum consultants, special area teachers, student camping, adult educational TV, library services, health services, etc.

Connecticut

1. Existing Units

Number There are eleven supervisory union districts that serve as quasi-intermediate units.

Type These units serve as an extension of the local districts with financial help from the state. They do not serve as a separate organizational structure between the local districts and the state.

Size In area the supervisory unions are relatively small when compared to a typical county in the nation.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory In 1903 the General Assembly authorized supervising agents (really superintendents of schools) for small towns employing a minimum number of teachers.

The agents were paid by the state but subject to direction from the local board. Revisions in this supervisory union were made in 1921, 1930, 1931, 1937, 1939, 1941, 1945 and 1969. These supervisory unions are not to be confused with regional schools established for special programs such as agriculture, adult education and special education. The regional districts are really operated as local school districts.

Levy Authority These quasi-intermediate units do not have any authority to levy taxes. They must rely on the local districts served for any expenses above and beyond the salaries paid by the state.

State Aid The salary of the superintendent and supervisors are paid by the state. These units do not qualify for any other type of state aid.

3. Program

Services The supervisory union assists the local districts in meeting the requirements of operation, program and reporting as established by the state. Special education programs are coordinated through this office, however, the operation and financing of a joint venture must be done by the local town districts.

Illinois

1. Existing Units

Number In 1968 there were 102 county units serving as intermediate units in the state. 1969 legislation authorizes a voluntary reduction in this number by 1973.

Type The county units serve as a regulatory arm of the state. The new units will be oriented toward providing services.

Size The average county unit was approximately 560 square miles in area. The new units will be combinations of counties with the area increasing accordingly.

Expenditure For 1965-66 the United States Office of Education reported total expenditures of $2,896,000 for the 102 county units. The new units are authorized to prorate the costs to the respective counties using the equalized and assessed value of property as the base.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The office of the county superintendent was provided for in Article 8, Paragraph 5, of the Illinois State Constitution. Laws of 1845 and 1847 outlined the duties of the office. In 1945 a county board of education was created to replace township boards. The relationship between the county board and the county superintendent is defined in the laws of 1945, 1951, 1953, and 1961. The legislation in 1969 changed the office of county superintendent to the superintendent of an educational service region. This same legislation authorized counties to form regions with minimum populations stipulated.

Levy Authority The county units as intermediate units had no taxing authority. The new regions do not have tax authority either.

State Aid Under the county system the state paid the salary of the superintendent and the assistant superintendent plus an additional $500 for supervisory services performed by the county units. The new units will qualify for state aid ordinarily paid for the special programs and services they provide.

Relationships to Districts The county unit supervised reports of local districts. It filed the treasurer's bonds. It apportioned funds allotted for land districts. The new units will continue these administrative services in addition to coordinating and offering many specialized instructional and personnel services.

3. Program

Services The county unit maintained a reference library of text materials for

the common school districts. It also conducted the testing program for the high school equivalence certificates. The new units will administer and coordinate cooperative or joint educational programs.

Indiana

1. Existing Units

Number As of July, 1969, the number of counties operating as intermediate units was sixteen. This is a decrease from ninety in 1954.

Type These units serve as a regulatory arm of the state. With the reorganization of small school districts the regulatory function is handled directly from the state to the local district. This has precluded the need for the county as an intermediate unit when all schools in a county have reorganized.

Size The typical intermediate unit serving one county is approximately 400 square miles in area.

Expenditures The costs of operating the intermediate unit are paid by the county. For the twenty-eight units operated during 1965-1966 the United States Office of Education reported total expenditures of $1,010.000.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The county unit was created in 1873 to replace the then existing township system. In 1899 the city schools employing superintendents were excluded from the jurisdiction of the county unit. Revisions of the county unit were made in 1913, 1927, and 1953. When all districts in a county are reorganized the office of the county superintendent has been abolished.

Levy Authority The county as an intermediate unit has no taxing authority. (Lake and Dearborn counties are exceptions.)

State Aid Any special education programs operated by an intermediate unit may collect the state aid for that program. In 1970 this will terminate.

Relationship to Districts The county unit assists local districts to meet the requirements of programs, operation and reporting as established by the state.

3. Program

Services Special education programs are operated by intermediate units in a limited number of cases. Through legislation in 1953 the county unit may act as the coordinating agent for joint employment of personnel and the joint purchases of supplies by local school district.

Iowa

1. Existing Units

Number As of July, 1969, there were fifty-eight intermediate units in Iowa. Thirty-one of these served a single county. Twenty-one served fifty counties which retained their separate county boards of education but were served and administered by joint agreements with other counties. Six served eighteen counties that had merged with the County Board of Education as well as the administration and service functions.

Type The intermediate units serve two functions. One is to be the regulatory arm of the state. The other is to be a service agency for the local school districts within its boundaries.

Size The typical county serving as an intermediate unit is approximately 550 square miles in area. As counties merge or as they enter joint agreements the area served increases correspondingly.

Expenditures For the 1968-1969 school year the average expenditure for the operating intermediate units was $177,000.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The office of the county superintendent was created in 1858. The laws of 1862, 1906, 1913, 1933, 1947 and 1957 extended the services required of this office and raised the requirements of the persons seeking the office. The 1947 law provided for a county board of education. The 1957 law authorized the joint employment of a county superintendent. The 1965 law authorized a joint board of education for two or more counties.

Levy Authority The county board of supervisors may levy from .25 to .75 of a mill for library purposes for the schools in the county. The county board of education certifies its levy on which there is no limit.

State Aid The intermediate units operating special programs that qualify for special aids may claim the aid. No aid is paid to the intermediate units for their administration or regulatory functions.

Relationship to Districts The intermediate unit is service oriented. It provides help in areas where the local districts are too small to economically provide a particular educational service. In some areas of the state, intermediate units operate special programs and in some cases they merely provide consultants.

3. Program

Services Administrative services are provided with an emphasis on coordination and promotional activities. Classes are conducted for educable, trainable and homebound pupils. Psychologists, speech therapists and audio-visual specialists are hired to serve schools. Consultants are provided in the areas of testing, special education, and curriculum. In some cases curriculum writing teams have been employed by the intermediate unit for an area-wide curriculum.

Kansas

1. Existing Units

Number The 105 county units existing in 1952 have all been terminated as of July 1, 1969. The records have been transferred to the offices of the County Register of Deeds.

Type The units during their existence served as a regulatory arm of the state.

Size During their existence these units averaged approximately 800 square miles in area.

Expenditures The expenses of the county offices were paid from the general county fund. For the year 1965-66 the United States Office of Education reported total expenditures of $700,000 for the 105 county units.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The office of county superintendent was created in 1861. Revisions were made in 1868, 1869, 1876, 1881, 1951 and 1953 prior to its termination in 1969.

Levy Authority The county unit had no authority to levy a tax. The county boards of supervisors made the levy for the operational expenses of the county unit.

State Aid The county as an intermediate unit did not qualify for any state aid.

Relationship to Districts The county unit assisted local districts to meet the state requirements for programs, operating procedures and reports. In 1953 the county board was permitted to act in place of the boards of common districts and rural high schools if they requested this to be done.

3. Program

Services No special educational services were provided through the county units. One exception to this was the permissive legislation that allowed a county board to employ a nurse to serve schools in counties over 175,000 population.

Maine

1. Existing Units

Number There were eighty-five supervisory union districts in 1966 covering the sixteen counties in the state.

Type These units served as an extension of the local district with financial support from the state.

Size Each unit is approximately 375 square miles in area.

Expenditures The expenditures is approximately $14 per pupil in the districts served.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory In 1954 supervisory unions were made mandatory for all districts with fewer than seventy-five teachers. This law revised in 1957 and again in 1963.

Levy Authority The supervisory union has no authority to levy taxes. Its costs are passed on to the districts it serves.

State Aid The supervisory union does not qualify for any state aid.

Relationship to Districts The supervisory union as an intermediate unit assists local districts in meeting requirements of operation, program and reporting as established by the state.

3. Program

Service No special educational services are provided through the supervisory union district.

Massachusetts

1. Existing Units

Number There were fifty-four supervisory union districts in 1966 covering the fourteen counties of the state.

Type These units serve as an extension of the local districts with financial help from the state. They do not serve as a separate organizational structure between the local districts and the state. The regional districts authorized in 1949 are in-practice local districts operating to provide a special education program.

Size The supervisory unions are relatively small in area when compared to the typical county in the nation. The fourteen counties in the state were in part covered by the fifty-four supervisory unions.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The union superintendency was authorized in 1870. It enabled two or more districts to share the services of a superintendent, supervisors and auxiliary personnel. In 1949, the regional school district planning boards were created. The laws affecting these were revised in 1951, 1952, 1955 and 1960.

Levy Authority Neither the supervisory unions nor the regional school districts have taxing authority. Their respective costs are passed on to the district they serve.

State Aid The districts in supervisory unions qualify for two-thirds of the superintendent's salary and expenses. The regional districts may claim the state aid for special programs they are operating. The regional districts also qualify for building aids.

3. Program

Services The supervisory union assists the local districts to meet the state requirements in program, operating procedures and reports. The office coordinates joint programs but the operation and financing of such programs must be done by the local town districts. The regional school districts conduct vocational programs, special education programs and in some cases employ physicians and nurses. The costs for these programs and services are prorated back to the local town districts.

Michigan

1. Existing Units

Number There were sixty intermediate units in 1969 serving all the elementary and secondary schools in the eighty-three counties.

Type These units are service oriented to provide educational services not available in individual districts.

Size The units range in size from 294 square miles to 2496 square miles with a median size of 701 square miles.

Expenditures For 1965-66 the state board of education reported total expenditures of $9,326,147 for the sixty intermediate units.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The present intermediate units are an out-growth of the county units created in 1841. The present legal structure dates from 1962 when the intermediate unit was created to replace and expand on the then existing county units.

Levy Authority The intermediate unit has the same general taxing authority as local districts in the state. Contingent upon a successful election, bonds may be sold to provide facilities for vocational education and special education.

State Aid The intermediate units qualify for special state aid allowances for each teacher employed in a typical education program and for expenses incurred for specialized personnel.

Relationships to Districts The intermediate units provide services requested by local districts. They are the coordinating agencies for services that individual districts cannot provide on an individual basis.

3. Program

Services Intermediate units provide consultants and supervisors upon request. They hire special education teachers. They direct, supervise and conduct cooperative education programs. They are permitted to conduct vocational schools and also schools for juveniles who are wards of the county.

Minnesota

1. Existing Units

Number As of July 1, 1969, there were thirty-three counties that operated with a county superintendent. Three intermediate units have been authorized in the metropolitan area. Three units have been empowered to operate area vocational schools. As of December 31, 1970, the elected office of the county superintendent will terminate. The 1969 legislation authorized the boards of county commissioners to appoint a county superintendent for any period of time up to December 31, 1972, to complete the necessary business of the office.

Type The county unit serves as a regulatory arm of the state. Specialized education services offered through the county units are found infrequently. The intermediate districts authorized in the metropolitan area are empowered to offer a specialized educational program.

Size The average size of the county units is approximately 9,100 square miles.

Expenditures The county units are supported by general county funds.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The county units were established as a regulatory arm of the state in 1862. The county superintendency was authorized in 1864 as an appointive office. The basic duties were written into law in 1905 and revisions have been made in 1941, 1947, 1953, 1955, 1957, and 1963. The legislation provides for the termination of the county superintendent as an elective office and as an appointive office. The three intermediate districts were authorized in 1967 and 1969.

Levy Authority The county units are supported through a levy of the county board of commissioners. The newly authorized intermediate districts may levy a property tax within their boundaries up to a statutory limit.

State Aid The county units do not qualify for state aid. The intermediate districts will qualify for aid based on the ADM of the pupils enrolled in the authorized programs.

Relationship to Districts The county unit does a limited amount of reporting for all common and independent districts in the county. It supervises the operation of the common school districts through teachers and board members of the common districts. The intermediate districts will operate as a unit separate from the districts within their boundaries.

3. Program

Services The county units provide supervision and regulatory services only. They do not conduct any education programs for pupils. The intermediate districts will be conducting typical vocational school programs with the possible addition of driver training and special education.

Mississippi

1. Existing Units

Number Out of eighty-two counties, eleven operate as intermediate units. There are sixty-eight counties that operate as the local unit of school organization.

Type The county unit serves as a regulatory arm of the state. Its main concerns are to maintain standards in schools and collect data for the state department of education.

Size The typical county serving as an intermediate unit is approximately 500 square miles in area.

Expenditures For 1965-66 the United States Office of Education reported $261,000 as the total expenditures for the eleven intermediate units in Mississippi.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The county superintendency is provided for in the Constitution (Article 8, Section 204) which was adopted in 1890. In 1953 countywide school systems were authorized to replace the existing county intermediate units. In 1956 the county superintendent was abolished in counties where municipal districts covered the entire county.

Levy Authority The intermediate unit must rely on the county boards of supervisors for its funds. It does not have authority to levy taxes. The county ad valorem tax is a levy made by the county board of supervisors.

State Aid Each county is allotted for "county administration" expenses. A sum of $15,000 plus $25 for each teacher unit in excess of fifty units, not to exceed $20,000. The county does act as the intermediate agent in collecting state aid for local districts and then distributing it to the local districts.

Relationship to Districts The county as an intermediate unit assists local districts to meet the state requirements of programs, operating procedures and reports. It arranges for high school students living in a district without high schools to attend in another district as non-resident students.

3. Program

Services The intermediate unit is mainly supervisory and thus it provides very limited educational services. It does supervise the distribution of the state's free textbooks in the county. It does the accounting of funds received and disbursed by the local districts. Transportation of students is coordinated through the intermediate unit office.

Missouri

1. Existing Units

Number In 1968 there were thirty-four intermediate units in the state. This was a reduction of eighty from the one-hundred fourteen that existed in 1964.

Type The present intermediate units are serving as regulatory arms of the state. A limited number of administrative services are provided to local districts within the boundaries of the respective intermediate units.

Size The typical county serving as an intermediate unit is approximately 650 square miles in area.

Expenditures For 1965-66 the United States Office of Education reported $515,000 as the total expenditures for the fifty-nine intermediate units then in existence.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The office of county superintendent is provided for in the State Constitution adopted in 1945. Significant revisions were made in 1963. The 1965 law permitted an election to terminate the office where it was responsible for fewer than three schools and 250 pupils.

Levy Authority The intermediate unit has no authority to levy taxes. It must rely on the county boards of supervisors for its operating expenses.

State Aid Considerable categorical aid is paid by the state to the intermediate unit for specific functions. The functions include the budget officer, the superintendent's salary, the transportation supervisor, clerical help and travel of the county board.

Relationship to Districts The intermediate unit has the responsibility of general supervision over all schools except where a school employs a superintendent who devotes half of his time to supervision. The county superintendent acts as the transportation supervisor for all common districts.

3. Program

Services Special educational services other than of an administrative nature are not provided.

Montana

1. Existing Units

Number There were fifty-six county units that served as intermediate units in Montana in 1968.

Type These units are mainly regulatory arms of the state. They do serve as a tax base for the foundation levy to support individual schools in the county.

Size The typical county serving as an intermediate unit is approximately 2600 square miles in area.

Expenditures The expenses are paid from the general fund of the respective county governments.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The office of county superintendent was authorized in the laws of 1871. In 1949 revisions were enacted.

Levy Authority The county commissioners levy the county-wide foundation tax. The county superintendent's office does not have authority to levy taxes.

State Aid The county unit does not qualify for any state aid. It apportions the state aid for local districts in the county but it does not receive any.

Relationship to Districts The county unit assists local districts in meeting the requirements of programs, operation and reporting as established by the state. It does this through school visitations and meetings conducted for school trustees.

3. Program

Services The county unit does not provide any special educational services outside of the administrative area.

Nebraska

1. Existing Units

Number There were nineteen educational service units that served as intermediate units in Nebraska in 1968. At the same time ninety-one of the ninety-three counties were served by a county superintendent of schools.

Type The county units serve as a regulatory arm of the state. The educational service units are oriented to provide specialized services for local districts.

Size The typical county serving as an intermediate unit is approximately 850 square miles in area. The typical educational service unit covers approximately 3000 square miles in area.

Expenditures For 1965-66 the United States Office of Education reported $971,000 as the total expenditures for the ninety-one counties serving as intermediate units. For 1967-68 the nineteen educational service units spent $1,736,000.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The duties and powers of the office of county superintendent were authorized in the laws of 1881. In 1961 legislation authorized two or more counties to join in hiring a superintendent. In 1967 legislation authorized a county to hire a part-time superintendent. Also in 1967 legislation created the structure for nineteen educational service units to cover all territory in the state.

Levy Authority The office of the county superintendent does not have any authority to levy taxes. His office is responsible for a non-resident high school tuition fund that is levied by the county board of commissioners. The newly created service units do have the authority to levy a tax up to a limit of one mill. For the 1967-68 school year the nineteen educational service units received $2,168,915. Of this amount 87% came from the property tax levied by them.

State Aid The county unit does not qualify for any state aid. The service units qualify for a limited amount of state aid for special education programs. For 1967-68 this aid accounted for less than 1% of the receipts for the nineteen educational service units.

Relationship to Districts The county unit assists local districts to meet the state requirements for programs, operating procedures, and reports. The educational service units provide specialized personnel and coordinate specialized programs for the local districts.

3. Program

Services The county provides education service for the handicapped. The participating districts are billed for their proportionate share. When high school districts are formed the county provides an elementary coordinator for all the Class I districts within that high school district. With the formation

of the educational service units the limited services of the county units have for the most part been assumed by the multi-county service units.

New Hampshire

1. Existing Units

Number There were forty-two supervisory union districts in 1968 covering the ten counties in the state. The twenty-five cooperative school districts and the twelve authorized regional enrollment areas are in actual practice local districts serving a number of town schools which retain their separate identities.

Type The supervisory union districts serve as an extension of the local districts with financial help from the state. They do not serve as a separate organizational structure between the local districts and the state.

Size The typical supervisory union is relatively small when compared to the county which is the basis of the intermediate unit in most states.

Expenditures The expenditures per pupil served by the supervisory union is approximately $14 for the administrative services provided.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory In 1899 legislation authorized supervisory unions. Revisions were made in 1919, 1921, 1927, 1961 and 1965. In 1947 and 1963 authorization was given to form cooperative school districts and regional enrollment areas.

Levy Authority The supervisory union has no authority to levy taxes. Its expenditures above and beyond the state aid are billed to the constituent districts.

State Aid The state pays a share of the salaries of the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, the business manager and subject consultants. The share is based on an equalization formula.

Relationship to Districts The supervisory union as an intermediate unit assists local districts in meeting requirements of operation, program and reporting as established by the state.

3. Program

Services The supervisory unions furnish administrative services. Cooperative and area schools may conduct the full range of educational programs and specialized services.

New Jersey

1. Existing Units

Number There were twenty-one county units serving as intermediate units in 1966.

Type These units are primarily a regulatory arm of the state. There is a limited effort to provide special education services that individual districts cannot provide on an individual basis.

Size The typical county serving as an intermediate unit is 350 square miles in area.

Expenditures For 1965-66 the United States Office of Education reported total expenditures of $506,000 for the twenty-one intermediate units. The costs of any specialized services are billed to the constituent districts ona prorata basis.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory Legislation in 1903 authorized the state commissioner of education to appoint a county superintendent in each county. Revisions were made in 1912, 1913, 1924, and 1927. Legislation in 1931 authorized regional school districts with the county superintendent designated as the general supervisor.

Levy Authority The county office has no authority to levy taxes. The county boards of supervisors levy the taxes to cover the general administration expenses of the office. In regional districts created for special purposes the people may vote tax levies and bond issues for the operation and facilities needed for the particular district.

State Aid The salary of the superintendent is paid by the state. Other expenses of his office are general county obligations. The county superintendent apportions state aid to local districts. The county unit qualifies for special state aids for which specialized programs entitle them. Audio-visual centers operated by a county will qualify for matching state funds up to a maximum of $2500.

Relationship to Districts The county unit assists local districts to meet the state requirements for programs, operating procedures and reports. City school districts with their own superintendents are excluded from the jurisdiction of the county superintendent.

3. Program

Services The county units are concerned primarily with administrative activities. They may operate audio-visual centers. The regional school districts are authorized to provide programs in vocational education, special education and health services.

New York

1. Existing Units

Number In 1948 there were 194 supervisory districts serving as intermediate units. In 1965 seventy of these were still operating through studies authorized by the legislature in 1945 and 1946. Legislation was passed in 1948 to authorize the formation of boards of cooperative educational services. During 1968 there were fifty-six in operation.

Type The boards of cooperative educational services are service oriented. They were formed as an interim structure until more adequate intermediate units could be formed to replace the supervisory districts. The regulatory function for the state is of very minor signifiance. These units exist to provide specialized educational services to the local districts in their area.

Expenditures For 1966-67 the total expenditures for the BOCES units was $50,880,000. The sources of funds are state aids for all approved programs and payments from local districts which share in the various services provided by these units.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory Supervisory districts were authorized in 1910. In 1948 legislation authorized boards of cooperative educational services as a service oriented intermediate unit in New York. These were intended to eventually replace the supervisory districts. In 1967 legislation gave a permanent status to the BOCES units.

Levy Authority The BOCES units do not have any authority to levy taxes. The operating funds are derived from state aids and local districts.

State Aid The intermediate units may claim state aid for the salaries of certificated personnel and administrative expenses up to a maximum amount per person. The state aids include administration, transportation, special education, vocational courses and adult education. The aid payments are based on the aid ratio for the respective districts.

Relationship to Districts Upon request of the local districts the intermediate unit provides special education programs. These units also act as the coordinating agency in the joint employment of personnel and cooperative research, cooperative purchasing and cooperative business operation.

3. Program

Services The special services include vocational education, education for atypical children, pupil accounting, pupil transportation for programs in operation, maintenance and business activities. The joint sharing of personnel is extensive.

North Dakota

1. Existing Units

Number There were fifty-three county units that served as intermediate units in the state in 1968.

Type These units are mainly regulatory arms of the state. They do serve as a tax base for the required twenty-one mill levy for education that is distributed to the local districts in the county with the $1 per capita tax levied on each adult for education purposes.

Size The typical county serving as an intermediate unit is approximately 1300 square miles in area.

Expenditures For the year 1965-66 the USOE report $603,000 as the total expenditures of the 53 intermediate units in the state.

2. Legal Status

Statutory The county superintendency was authorized in the Constitution of 1889. Legislation concerning it has been passed in 1890, 1895, 1897, 1899, 1905, 1911, 1913, 1943, and 1957. In 1967 legislation authorized two counties to jointly employ one superintendent.

Levy Authority The county unit does not have authority to levy taxes. It has to rely on the board of county commissioners. The twenty-one mill county equalization levy required by law is administered through the office of the county superintendent, however, his office does not qualify for any part of it.

State Aid These units do not qualify for any state aid. The state equalization fund is paid to the county and apportioned to local districts through the office of the county superintendent.

Relationship to Districts The county unit assists local districts in meeting the requirements of programs, operation and reporting as established by the state. It does this through school visitations and meetings conducted for school officers in the county.

3. Program

Services The county does not provide any special educational services outside of the administrative area.

Ohio

1. Existing Units

Number In 1968 there were 88 county units serving as intermediate units in the state.

Type These units served a dual purpose. They were regulatory arms of the state and they also served as service agencies for local school districts.

Size The typical county serving as an intermediate unit was approximately 450 square miles in area.

Expenditures The office space and general maintenance are provided by the respective county boards of commissioners. There is considerable variation in the overall services provided from county to county. In 1967-68 expenditures ranged from $13,500 in one county to $293,600 in another county.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The county unit was authorized in the Ohio Constitution. The laws of 1953 authorized a county board with the power to provide services that individual

districts could not feasibly provide for themselves. Presently a joint legislative commission is drafting legislation to revise the intermediate unit in Ohio.

Levy Authority The county units do not have any authority to levy taxes. After state aids are claimed the remaining costs are billed to the constituent districts.

State Aid This is extensive. The reimbursement for the many special services permitted has a $100 deductible feature for each classroom unit. Above that the state reimburses the full cost.

Relationship to Districts The county unit assists local districts in meeting the requirements of program, operation and reporting as established by the state. Permissive legislation has been enacted to allow the county unit to provide services in special education and specialized educational services that individual districts cannot provide on an individual basis.

3. Program

Services Besides the typical administrative services of a county intermediate unit the specialized services are extensive. These specialized services include: data processing, supervisors and consultants, speech therapists, psychologists, library and audio-visual, vocational classes, special education classes, etc.

Oklahoma

1. Existing Units

Number There were seventy-seven counties serving as intermediate units in 1968 to cover the state. During 1969 fourteen counties operated without a qualified superintendent and in two counties the office was closed.

Type The county unit serves as a regulatory arm of the state. Its main concerns are to maintain standards in schools and collect data for the state.

Size The typical county serving as an intermediate unit is approximately 1200 square miles in area.

Expenditures For 1967-68 the total expenditures of the seventy-seven intermediate units was $1,100,000. (In 1965-66 the USOE reported $152,000 as the total expenditures. This was the state's share of the salaries of the county superintendents in that year. It did not include all the other expenditures.)

2. Legal Basis

Statutory Legislation of 1913 authorized a county superintendent of public instruction. In 1949 this was changed to county superintendent of schools and then further amended in 1955 and 1961.

Levy Authority The intermediate unit has no authority to levy taxes for its own expenses. It does act as the agency to collect and apportion the 4-mill county-wide levy on property.

State Aid The state pays part of the superintendent's salary in each county. The intermediate unit also collects state aid for the special education programs it conducts.

Relationship to Districts The intermediate unit has the responsibility of general supervision over all schools. It assists local districts in meeting the requirements of program, operation and reporting as established by the state. It apportions taxes to the schools within the county.

3. Program

Services The specialized services are mainly in two areas. One is special education and the other is in audio-visual. The legislation authorizing services for audio-visual dates from 1947 and for the programs for exceptional children from 1949.

Oregon

1. Existing Units

Number There were twenty-nine intermediate units in the state in 1968 covering the thirty-six counties. Currently, a state plan is in the process of adoption. That would reduce this number to fourteen.

Type Historically the intermediate unit was a regulatory arm of the state. This was changed considerably in 1963 when legislation authorized extensive service functions for the intermediate unit.

Size The typical intermediate unit is approximately 3500 square miles in area.

Expenditures For the year 1965-66 the USOE reported $2,752,000 as the total expenditures of the thirty intermediate units in the state.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The office of county superintendent was authorized in the early history of the state. In 1959 county districts as local units were authorized. In 1963 the functions of the county as a service unit were authorized.

Levy Authority The intermediate units have full taxing authority to fund the authorized functions. It also serves as the taxing unit for 50% of the current expenses of the constituent districts. This is intended to equalize the local tax support for education.

State Aid The intermediate unit qualifies for state aid for the special education programs it conducts.

Relationship to Districts The intermediate unit provides services which the local districts cannot feasibly provide on an individual basis. The regulatory function is a minor part of the activity of the intermediate unit. It does conduct hearings on the budgets of local districts prior to making the levy for 50% of the current expenses.

3. Program

Services The program of services offered is intended to equalize educational opportunity for all children in the state. The services include curriculum improvement, special education programs, central purchasing, library and curriculum materials, and special teachers, etc.

Pennsylvania

1. Existing Units

Number In 1966 there were sixty-six (Philadelphia was excluded) intermediate units serving the sixty-seven counties in the state. In 1969 legislation authorized twenty-nine intermediate units to replace the existing units.

Type Historically the intermediate unit was a regulatory arm of the state. This was changed considerably in 1965 when legislation authorized extensive service functions for the intermediate unit. The 1969 legislation extends this service function of the intermediate units.

Size The typical intermediate unit in 1966 was approximately 700 square miles. The units created in 1969 are approximately double this size.

Expenditures For the year 1965-66 the United States Office of Education reported total expenditures of $4,419,000 for the sixty-six intermediate units. This figure is a rough estimate because the units were supported from three sources. The county boards of supervisors paid for the office, the clerical help, and supplies. The state paid the salaries of the superintendent, his assistants, and the supervisors of special education. The averages in salaries and all other program expenses were prorated amongst the participating districts. The units authorized in 1969 will be financed from state support for approved budgets on an equalized basis and from local districts for their proportionate share of the costs.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The legislation of 1854 authorized the county superintendent as the general supervisor of public schools in the county. It was an elective office. Revisions were made in 1911, 1931, 1937 and 1949. The 1949 legislation authorized districts with their own superintendent to become part of the county unit for the specialized services. In 1965 legislation authorized the county unit to operate and coordinate many specialized educational services and programs. The 1969 legislation revised and extended the service functions of the intermediate unit.

Levy Authority The intermediate unit does not have any authority to levy taxes.

State Aid A high proportion of state aid is collected by the intermediate units. Prior to 1969 aid was paid for specified personnel. This has been changed by the 1969 law so aid will be paid on an approved budget for each respective intermediate unit. A unique feature exists in Pennsylvania for payment by the local district to the intermediate unit. The amount to be paid by the local district to the intermediate unit is reported to the commonwealth. Then this amount is withheld from the state aid for the respective districts and paid by the commonwealth directly to the intermediate unit.

Relationship to Districts The intermediate unit provides services which the local districts cannot feasibly provide on an individual basis. The regulatory function is a minor part of the total program of the intermediate unit.

3. Program

Services The committee appointed in 1953 recommended eighteen services, twenty supervisory functions and thirty-three coordinating functions for intermediate units. The enabling legislation permits any service that a majority of the districts desire and for which they have the authority to spend funds on an individual basis. The units created in 1969 have the same authority as well as all the powers of the county units and vocational-technical boards which they replaced.

South Carolina

1. Existing Units

Number There were sixteen counties serving as intermediate units in 1968. These were the counties in which more than one local school district was operating.

Type The county unit serves as a regulatory arm of the state. This function is to help the local schools maintain standards and to collect data for the state. The county unit does provide rather extensive specialized services for the local districts.

Size The typical county serving as an intermediate unit is approximately 650 square miles in area.

Expenditures The county government provides office space. The other expenses of the intermediate unit are made from state funds for specific functions and functions and from local districts for programs conducted.

2. Legal Status

Statutory The Constitution of South Carolina, Article XI, Section 3, created the structure for the public schools of the state. In legislation of 1896 the duties and responsibilities of the county superintendent was established. There is considerable variation from county to county in actual practice because legislation has permitted individual counties to develop their own operational procedures.

Levy Authority The intermediate unit has no authority to levy taxes. In the majority of intermediate unit counties the county legislative delegation levies the tax for the submitted budget.

State Aid The state pays aid for designated categories to each county unit. The intermediate units are treated the same as the county units operating as local districts.

Relationship to Districts The county as an intermediate unit assists local districts to meet state requirements of programs, operating procedures and reports. It also apportions taxes to local districts each month.

3. Program

Services The intermediate unit provides administrative, instructional and personnel services. It serves in a way similar to a central district office with the local districts maintaining their identity.

South Dakota

1. Existing Units

Number In 1968 there were sixty-four county units serving the state as intermediate units.

Type The units are primarily a regulatory arm of the state to supervise common school districts. The county also serves as the tax base for the common school district equalization fund and the non-resident high school tuition fund. Only the areas not in high school districts are included in these tax levies.

Size The typical county serving as an intermediate unit in 1968 was approximately 800 square miles.

Expenditures For 1965-66 the United States Office of Education reported total expenditures of $693,000 for the sixty-four county units. In 1967-68 the range was from a low of $6,845 to a high of $30,646.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The office of county superintendent was authorized in Article IX, Section 5, of the state constitution. The powers and duties were established by legislation in 1877. Revisions were authorized in 1936, 1954, 1960, 1964, and 1966. In 1967 legislation authorized an election to eliminate the office in a county when fewer than five public school classrooms existed in the county.

Levy Authority The county unit does not have any authority to levy taxes. All school taxes levied at the county level must be levied by the county board of supervisors.

State Aid The county unit serving as an intermediate unit does not qualify for any state aid.

Relationship to Districts The county unit assists local common school districts to meet state requirements in programs, operating procedures and reports. It apportions taxes to the local districts and audits the budgets of the local districts.

3. Program

Services The county unit is responsible for the supervision, testing programs and related instructional activities in elementary classrooms operated by common school districts, private and parochial school systems. The county unit may provide specialized services in library, audio-visual services and subject matter consultants.

Texas

1. Existing Units

Number In 1968 there were 202 county units serving as intermediate units in the 254 counties of the state. There were also twenty regional media and service centers covering the state.

Type The intermediate units serve a dual purpose. The county units are regulatory arms of the state while providing a limited number of specialized services. The recently established regional service and media centers also

provide coordination for many specialized services.

Expenditures For 1965-66 the United States Office of Education reported total expenditures of $5,471,000 for the 202 county intermediate units. The regional centers may spend up to $2.00 per pupil in average daily attendance for educational media. The other programs are limited only by the willingness of local districts to fund joint programs.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory Legislation in 1905 authorized a county superintendent where 3000 pupils were enrolled in the county. This was revised in 1934. Then in 1961 legislation authorized elections to abolish the office and transfer the duties to the county judge when the number of districts and pupils fell below a certain figure. Legislation in 1965 authorized the twenty regional media centers. In 1967 the service function was added to the regional centers.

Levy Authority The county intermediate unit has no authority to levy taxes.

State Aid All of the county superintendent's salary is paid by the state. When special education programs are conducted by the county or the region it may claim the state aid for that program. The regional centers may qualify for special state aid for educational media. This aid is paid on a 50-50 matching basis up to a maximum of $1.00 per pupil in average daily attendance.

Relationship to Districts The county unit assists local districts in meeting the requirements of program, operation and reporting as established by the state. Permissive legislation has authorized the county unit to provide educational services that individual districts cannot provide on an individual basis. The regional centers act as the coordinating agent for joint programs that are funded by local districts or with federal funds.

3. Program

Service Numerous pupil personnel and special education services are provided by the county and regional units. The county unit supervises the state free textbook system. It also apportions school taxes to the local districts.

Vermont

1. Existing Units

Number In 1966 there were forty-six supervisory unions serving as intermediate units in the state.

Type These units serve as regulatory arms of the state and as coordinating agencies to provide educational services which individual districts cannot provide individually.

Size The typical intermediate unit covered approximately 200 square miles.

Expenditures For 1965-66 the USOE reported $1,259,000 as the total expenditures of the forty-six intermediate units in the state.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory In 1923 legislation authorized the state board to divide the state into supervisory unions with approximately fifty teachers. The schools with forty teachers were to be excluded. Revisions were made in 1933, 1935, 1947 and 1955. In 1967 legislation authorized joint agreements between supervisory unions for programs, service and staff.

Levy Authority The supervisory union has no levy authority. All expenses are billed to the local districts on a proportionate basis.

State Aid No state aid is available for these supervisory unions.

Relationship to Districts The supervisory union as an intermediate unit assists local districts in meeting requirements of operation, program and reporting as established by the state.

3. Program

Services Pupil personnel and special education services may be provided through joint agreements between supervisory unions.

Washington

1. Existing Units

Number In 1968 there were thirty-one county units serving as intermediate units in the state. As of July 1, 1969, these have been replaced with six intermediate districts for the entire state.

Type Historically the county unit was a regulatory arm of the state. The new units are primarily service agencies.

Expenditures For 1965-66 the United States Office of Education reported $1,916,000 as the total expenditures for the then existing thirty-eight intermediate units.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The county as an intermediate unit was authorized by legislation in 1881. It revised in 1890, 1897, 1903, 1909, and 1915. In 1955 legislation authorized two counties to join or abolish the office. In 1959 a study was authorized for intermediate units. In 1965 legislation authorized the formation of intermediate districts. In 1969 legislation mandated a state plan for six units to replace all the existing county units.

Levy Authority The intermediate units do not have authority to levy taxes. They must rely on county boards of commissioners to levy the taxes they need. The county unit administers the one percent real estate transfer tax and the non-resident high school tuition tax. It does not make the levies, however.

State Aid The intermediate units qualify for state aid for special programs they operate.

Relationship to Districts The new intermediate units are coordinating agencies for specialized services and programs for local districts.

3. Program

Services The new intermediate units are authorized to provide and/or coordinate any and all services for local districts that will provide equal educational opportunities for all youth in the state.

Wisconsin

1. Existing Units

Number In 1968 there were nineteen intermediate units serving the state. These were called cooperative education service agencies.

Type These units are service oriented to provide educational services not available in individual districts.

Size The typical intermediate unit covered approximately 2800 square miles.

Expenditures For 1965-66 the United States Office of Education reported total administrative expenditures of $551,000 for the intermediate units. For 1967-68 the local districts reported total expenditures of $2,158,300 for the contractual agreements for shared services coordinated by the cooperative education service agencies.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The county unit with a county superintendent was authorized in 1863. The cooperative Educational Service Agencies replaced the county units as intermediate units in 1965.

Levy Authority The intermediate units in Wisconsin do not have authority to levy taxes. The county boards of commissioners levy the taxes for the $350 teacher aid in the county.

State Aid Each intermediate unit (CESA) is paid up to $29,000 as a flat grant state aid for administrative costs. For 1967-68 the total for the state was $512,695. The intermediate units may also claim state aid for the special education programs they conduct. For 1967-68 the total state aid paid to the intermediate units for these programs was $272,755.

Relationship to Districts The intermediate units are service and coordinating agencies for local districts. Upon request the intermediate district will contract with any combination of local districts for any educational service they want and for which they are willing to pay their proportionate share.

3. Program

Services The services provided are numerous. They are mainly in the areas of pupil personnel services, special education programs, curricular materials and in-service training.

Wyoming

1. Existing Units

Number In 1968 there were twenty intermediate units serving the state. These were all abolished in 1969. Legislation in 1969 authorized any two school district boards or community college boards or any combination thereof to form a board of cooperative educational services.

Type The county as the intermediate unit was primarily a regulatory arm of the state. The newly created BOCES are service oriented.

Size The county intermediate unit covered approximately 4,200 square miles. The size of the new units will depend on the combinations that are formed.

Expenditures For 1965-66 the United States Office of Education reported total expenditures of $220,000 for the then existing twenty intermediate units in the state.

2. Legal Basis

Statutory The county as an intermediate unit was authorized in the state constitution, Article 14, Section 1. Legislation concerning the powers and duties of the office was passed in 1876, 1886, 1910, 1925, 1927, 1931 and 1945. In 1957 legislation authorized termination of the office in certain counties with the duties being transferred to the county treasurer. In 1969 all offices of county superintendents were abolished and replaced with boards of cooperative education services.

Levy Authority The county unit did not have any authority to levy taxes. The newly formed BOCES do not have any authority to levy taxes. The county boards of commissioners levy the county tax for the county support of classroom units and bus drivers.

State Aid The county units did not qualify for any state aid. The newly created BOCES do not qualify for any state aid.

Relationship to Districts Historically the county unit assisted the local districts to meet the requirements of program, operation and reports as established by the state. The new units will provide specialized services so equal opportunities will be available to all school children in the state.

3. Program

Services The specialized services were not provided by the county unit. The change in organization of the intermediate unit is so current that the new programs have not been put into operation.

Footnotes

[1]U. S. Office of Education, The Common Core of State Educational Information, State Educational Records and Reports Series Handbook I, Bulletin 1953, No. 8 (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1953), p. 2.

CHAPTER IV

STATE AIDS TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Educational finance in the United States is characterized by differing patterns of state support. In this section information on state aids provided to local school districts is presented from selected years from 1948 through 1968. Table 4-1 illustrates the nature of the differences in the percentage of total revenue provided by state governments to local school districts. During the twenty year period twenty-one of the states have increased the percentage of support. These percentage increases range from minor changes to significant revisions in the state finance program. The balance of the states reported decreases which again range from minor to significant in terms of state funds provided to local school districts.

A brief review of the state aids which make up the state finance program for elementary and secondary schools is included for each state. The aids are categorized by general and special purpose. A further break-down includes flat grants and equalizing grants. Immediately following the review of aids is a tabulation of the specific acts provided by the legislature in each state. This tabulation is by purpose and title of the aid. For selected years the tabulation reports the percentage that the aid represents in the total state aid allocation. In 1949-50 358 state aids were provided to school districts. On the basis of information reported in this study the number of state aids for 1968-69 were a total of 427.

U. S. Office of Education Publications were used to develop information presented in this section. Appropriate citations are included with the tables. In addition, preliminary copies of the tables were submitted to the State Department of Education contacts for additional information when required and verification of the compilation. Changes indicated on the preliminary copies have been reflected in the tables included in this document.

TABLE 4 - 1

Percentage of Revenue Receipts From State Governments for Public Schools, By States

(Selected Years 1948-1968)

Fiscal Year	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
Alabama	74.2%	75.7%	76.9%	72.8%	71.8%	60.1%
Arizona	46.4	27.9	30.9	34.1	32.8	24.0
Arkansas	62.4	51.1	45.2	48.6	49.1	52.3
California	47.5	39.0	41.1	40.9	37.6	34.9
Colorado	20.8	18.1	18.6	19.5	23.4	27.1
Connecticut	24.8	19.0	24.2	34.6	32.7	30.0
Delaware	86.4	88.2	83.7	82.5	80.3	82.0
Florida	52.8	47.8	53.2	56.5	53.4	42.2
Georgia	57.9	64.7	64.8	64.0	64 2	54.6
Idaho	23.6	18.4	25.6	27.7	30.7	44.0
Illinois	15.9	15.4	24.0	20.7	23.0	21.8
Indiana	39.6	36.2	33.5	29.9	32.8	28.1
Iowa	13.9	14.7	13 2	12.0	10.0	34.0
Kansas	11.4	22.4	23.2	19.2	20.6	32.3
Kentucky	42.1	38.5	35.9	45.8	55.6	45.4
Louisiana	60.9	70.9	63.0	70.2	60.0	61.0
Maine	26.8	22.0	27.1	25.8	28.2	29.6
Maryland	40.7	40.6	32.6	34.2	33.8	31.5
Massachusetts	12.6	18.3	21.2	19.9	21.5	19.5
Michigan	54.5	55.4	48.5	43.2	42.7	50.0
Minnesota	37.4	38.9	39.9	39.7	40.3	40.0
Mississippi	50.8	45.9	51.9	56.5	57.0	48.1
Missouri	34.4	35.5	36.5	31.0	32.4	33.0
Montana	17.8	25.6	24.8	23.6	35 4	25.0
Nebraska	5.5	6.6	6.5	6.5	6.4	18.3
Nevada	37.1	31.3	41.2	51.3	49.8	45.8
New Hampshire	18.3	4.9	6.0	6.3	8.3	7.5
New Jersey	16.2	12.5	24.2	23.7	21.8	N/A
New Mexico	87.5	76.6	64.9	74.4	68.5	77.0
New York	32.6	40.5	35.7	39.5	43.0	50.0
North Carolina	66.2	67.9	69.0	66.7	67.6	62.8
North Dakota	26.3	27.4	25.8	26.4	23.9	N/A
Ohio	39.6	30.6	30.0	27.7	25.9	25.4
Oklahoma	50.1	47.9	43.1	27.7	31.6	35.0
Oregon	37.5	30.6	27.2	29.0	26.3	30.0
Pennsylvania	35.9	34.1	46.0	45.8	42.9	44.4
Rhode Island	19.4	14.4	15.9	23.2	30.4	29.2
South Carolina	60.7	57.3	74.5	66.7	66.2	55.0
South Dakota	17.5	11.7	10.1	8.9	9.2	11.0
Tennessee	51.7	55.4	58.7	58.0	57.2	47.9
Texas	50.0	58.4	53.9	49.9	55.1	47.7
Utah	45.5	38.6	37.8	44.1	49.8	47.2
Vermont	25.5	21.7	25.7	24.7	24.0	22.5
Virginia	42.8	41.1	34.9	37.0	40.6	38.0
Washington	62.7	61.1	53.7	61.6	61.2	56.1
West Virginia	64.0	64.3	59.5	52.9	52.7	60.0
Wisconsin	19.6	16.3	19.4	22.6	25.9	28.0
Wyoming	29.6	34.4	39.5	47.5	41.3	41.0
UNITED STATES (AVE.)	38.9%	38.6%	39.5%	39.1%	39.3%	39.0% (E)

Source: USOE, Statistics of State School Systems 1947-48, 1951-52, 1955-56 1959-60, 1963-64, 1967-68 and by contact with individual state departments.

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Alabama reported six state aids paid to local school districts. 10.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 85.8% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 3.7% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Alabama reported six state aids for local school districts 6.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 89.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 4.2% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing - Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR ALABAMA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	10.5	10.0	8.3	6.5	6.5
1. Public School Fund		10.0	8.3	6.5	6.5
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	85.8	87.2	87.6	89.5	89.3
1. Minimum Program Fund	85.6	87.1	87.6	89.5	89.3
2. Transfer	.2	.1	.0	.0	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	3.7	2.8	4.1	4.0	4.2
1. Vocational Fund	3.6	2.8	4.1	3.6	3.9
2. Textbook Fund		.0	.0	.0	.0
3. Revolving Fund		.0	.0	-	-
4. Trainable	.1	-	-	.2	.1
5. Driving Training		-	-	.1	.1
6. Illiteracy	.0	.0	-	.0	.1
7. Adult Ed.					
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL AIDS NUMBER	6	6	4	9	7

Summary of State Support by Type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	10.5	6.5	1	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	85.8	89.3	2	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	3.7	4.2	3	5
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	0	0
	100.0%	100.0%	6	7

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" -" = aids not included

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Arizona reported four state aids paid to local school districts. 95.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 4.5% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Arizona reported nine state aids for local school districts. 46.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 50.9% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 2.5% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR ARIZONA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	95.5%	94.5%	96.2%	72.8%	46.7%
1. State School Fund		89.3	96.2	72.8	46.7
2. Endowment		5.2	-	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	14.5%	50.9%
1. Financial Ass't.		-	-	-	43.1
2. Equalization for common & H.S.		-	-	14.5	7.8
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	4.5%	5.5%	3.8%	12.4%	2.5%
1. Textbook		4.8	2.9	-	-
2. Vocational		.6	.8	2.2	1.3
3. Homebound		.1	.1	.1	.1
4. Special Education		-	-	.8	.6
5. Trainable		-	-	.3	.3
6. Guardian Assistance		-	-	.1	.1
7. National Forest		-	-	9.2*	.1
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	4	5	4	11	9

Summary of State Support by type of aids:

TYPE	Percent		Number	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	95.5%	46.7%	2	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	-	50.9	0	2
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	4.5	2.5	2	6
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	0	0
	100.0%	100.0%	4	9

*Including tax collections fund, endowment, mis., national forest

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" -" = aids not included

ARKANSAS - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Arkansas reported eight state aids paid to local school districts. 26.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 22.0% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants and 51.5% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Arkansas reported eleven state aids for local school districts. 1.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 87.2% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 11.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR ARKANSAS

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	26.5%	3.0%	2.2%	1.8%	1.5%
1. Public School Fund		3.0	2.2	1.8	1.5
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	74.2%	80.4%	84.4%	87.2%
1. Minimum Foundation	-	74.2	80.4	84.8	87.2
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	22.0%	22.8%	17.4%	13.7%	11.4%
1. Equalizing TSPN		16.0	12.5	9.4	7.5
2. Free Textbook		2.0	2.2	1.5	1.6
3. Vocational Ed.		3.8	2.0	1.4	1.1
4. County School		.2	.4	.4	.4
5. Handicapped		.3	.2	.6	.4
6. Audio-Visual		.2	.1	.1	.1
7. Guidance & Counseling		-	-	.1	.1
8. Adult Education		-	-	.1	.1
9. Orphans		-	-	.1	.1
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	51.5%	-	-	-	-
TOTAL AIDS NUMBER	8	8	8	11	11

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of Aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	26.5	1.5	1	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	-	87.2	0	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	22.0	11.4	6	9
Special-Purpose Equalizing	51.5	-	1	0
	100.0%	100.0%	8	11

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

CALIFORNIA - State Aids and Expenditures

1. Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of California reported ten aids paid to school districts. 76.9% of the aid funds were appropriated for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 4.5% for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants, and the balance of 18.6% for Special-Purpose and General-Equalization Grants.

For the 1968-69 fiscal year California reported seventeen aids. The number of aids increased to fourteen in 1957-8. In 1966-67 aids increased by one and also several aids were consolidated into the "Basic Aid" and "Equalization Aid" sections. In 1968-69, 45.3% of the aid was paid for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. The Equalizing section of aids comprised 37.8%. The balance of 15.9% for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	76.9%	66.9%	64.2%	55.1%	45.3%
1. Basic Aid - Elem.		49.0	46.6		
2. Basic Aid - H. S.		15.1	14.4	55.1	45.3
3. Basic Aid - Jr. Coll.		2.8	3.2		
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	17.2%	26.8%	28.0%	31.6%	36.4%
1. Equalization for Elem.		16.2	17.6		
2. Growth Fund		6.7	6.5		
3. Equalization for H.S.		3.1	3.1	31.6	36.4
4. Equalization for Jr. Coll.		.6	.7		
5. Final Adjustment		.2	.1		
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	4.5%	4.5%	5.8%	11.4%	15.9%
1. County School		2.5	2.7	1.7	1.3
2. Handicapped/Exceptional Children		1.4	1.5	5.1	8.2
3. Mentally Retarded (1)		.5	.9	(1)	(1)
4. Driver Training		.1	.4	.8	.9
5. Special Transp.		-	.3	(1)	(1)
6. Adult Ed.		-	-	1.6	1.6
7. Elem. Reading		-	-	-	.8
8. Free textbook - elem.		-	-	.7	1.6
9. Children's centers.	-	-	-	.7	1.0
10. Jr. Coll. tuition	-	-	-	.4	.1
11. Pre-School Compensatory	-	-	-	.2	.3
12. Physical therapists-Sp. Ed.	-	-	-	.2	.1
13. Instr. T.V.	-	-	-	.0	.0
14. Voc. Ed.	-	-	-	.0	.0
15. State project areas	-	-	-	.0	.0
16. Compensatory Ed.	-	-	-	-	.8
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT					
1. Transportation	1.4%	1.8%	2.0%	1.6%	1.4%

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR CALIFORNIA

TOTAL AIDS NUMBER	10	13	14	15(2)	17

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of Aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	76.9	45.3	3	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	17.2	36.4	3	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	4.5	15.9	3	14
Special-Purpose Equalizing	1.4	1.4	1	1
	100.0%	100.0%	10	17

(1) Included under handicapped
(2) Several previous aids combined

NOTE: In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

".0%" = less than .05%
"- " = aids not included

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Colorado reported six state aids paid to local school districts. 37.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants 31.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 22.2% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 8.9% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Colorado reported eight state aids for local school districts. 33.9% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 54.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 11.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR COLORADO

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	37.3%	57.5%	12.3%	25.4%	33.9%
1. School Fund - Attendance		56.2	10.9	-	-
2. School Fund - Jr. College		1.3	1.4	3.9	-
3. Public Sch. Prop. Tax Relief					
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	31.6%	39.6%	80.7%	61.3%	54.7%
1. School Equalizing & Excess Growth		39.6	80.7	61.3	54.7
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	22.2%	1.8%	6.4%	13.0%	11.4%
1. Transportation			4.5	5.1	5.2
2. Handicapped		1.2	1.4	3.2	4.3
3. Vocational		.6	.4	-	-
4. District organization		-	.1	-	-
5. Small attendance		-	-	1.3	1.2
6. Jr. Coll. Consm.		-	-	2.9	-
7. Contingency Reserve/Low Income		-	-	.1	.3
8. Migrant Children		-	-	.2	.2
9. State NDEA Portion		-	-	.2	.2
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	8.9%	1.1%	.6%	.3%	-
1. Emergency portion		1.1	.6	.3	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	6	6	8	11	8

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	37.3%	33.9%	1	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	31.6	54.7	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	22.2	11.4	3	6
Special-Purpose Equalizing	8.9	-	1	-
	100.0%	100.0%	6	8

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

CONNECTICUT - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Connecticut reported nine state aids paid to local school districts. 86.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 13.6% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1967-68 year Connecticut reported thirteen state aids paid to local school districts. 73.9% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 21.6% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 4.5% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR CONNECTICUT

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	67-8
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	86.4%	81.8%	82.8%	72.3%	73.9%
1. Per Pupil Aid		81.7	82.6	72.1	73.7
2. Tax Exempt Prop.		.1	.2	.2	.25
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	13.6%	13.1%	14.0%	22.7%	21.6%
1. Buildings		9.7	10.7	12.6	11.62
2. P. Handicapped		1.6	1.2	1.5	1.35
3. M. Handicapped			.7	2.0	1.15
4. Vocational & I/A		1.1	.5	.18	.3
5. Adult Education		.4	.2	.37	.2
6. Driver Education		-	.2	.3	.32
7. Vocational Agri.		-	-	.3	.3
8. Library		-	.1	.1	.1
9. Disadvantaged Children		-	-	5.4	4.78
10. Emotionally Maladjusted				.63	.73
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	5.1%	3.1%	4.94%	4.54%
1. Elem. Tspn. ⟩ combined 67'		4.2	2.4	-	-
2. H.S. Tspn. ⟩ combined 67'		.9	.5	3.94	3.6
3. Voc. Tspn.			.2	.27	.23
4. Secondary (Out of town)				.36	.31
5. Handicapped				.37	.40
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	9	9	15	17	18

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1967-68	1949-50	1967-68
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	86.4%	73.6%	1	2
General-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	0	-
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	13.6	21.6	8	11
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	4.5	0	4
	100.0%	100.0%	9	17

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.
B. ".0%" = less than .05%
"-" = aids not included

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Delaware reported five state aids paid to local school districts. 78.0% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 22.0% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants or General-Purpose Equalizing Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Delaware reported three state aids for local school districts. 82.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 17.6% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants or General Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AID FOR DELAWARE

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	78.0%	54.0%	42.3%	78.6%	82.4%
1. Current Expenditure and Minor Capital Outlay			42.3	78.6	82.4
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT -none-	-	-	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	22.0%	46.0%	57.7%	21.4%	17.6%
1. School Construction			54.5	17.4	13.8
2. Transportation			2.2	4.0	3.8
3. Exceptional Children			1.0	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT -none-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	5	9	4	3	3

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of Aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	78.0%	82.4%	1	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	22.0	17.6	4	2
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.0%	5	3

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" -" = aids not included

FLORIDA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Florida reported two state aids paid to local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 98.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 1.5% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Florida reported fourteen state aids for local school districts. 6.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 78.2% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 15.1% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AID FOR FLORIDA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	-	10.6%	12.4%	6.7%
1. Sales Tax Fund		-	10.4	9.5	5.0
2. Permanent School Fund		-	.2	.3	.2
3. Racing Commission		-	-	2.6	1.5
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	98.5%	98.0%	71.7%	67.3%	78.2%
1. Foundation Program K-12		98.0	71.7	59.3	69.0
2. Foundation for Jr. Coll.		-	-	8.0	9.2
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	1.5%	2.0%	17.7%	20.3%	15.1%
1. Capital Outlay Debt		-	7.6	6.8	3.8
2. County School Add'n		-	7.0	2.4	4.7
3. Jr. College Constr.		-	1.5	6.8	3.6
4. Textbook		2.0	1.3	1.9	1.4
5. Driver Education		-	.3	.5	.3
6. Vocational - Technical		-	-	1.5	.6
7. Post - Secondary Fund		-	-	-	.2
8. Exceptional Children - Equipm.		-	-	-	.2
9. Exceptional Children - Facilities		-	-	-	.3
10. School Lunch Salary Supp.		-	-	.4	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	2	2	8	10	14

Summary of state support by type of aids:

TYPE	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	6.7%	-	3
General-Purpose Equalizing	98.5	78.2	1	2
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	1.5	15.1	1	9
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.0%	2	14

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" -" = aids not included

GEORGIA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Georgia reported eight state aids paid to local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 31.2% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 68.8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Georgia reported three state aids for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 89.0% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 2.2% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 8.8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR GEORGIA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	6.6%	-	-	-
1. Other Current		6.6			
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	31.2%	2.9%	83.8%	85.7%	89.0%
1. Foundation Program			83.8	85.7	89.0
2. Contingent Fund		2.9	-		
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	68.8%	81.0%	6.0%	5.0%	2.2%
1. Textbook		2.1	3.3	1.8	-
2. Library		.9	-	-	
3. Vocational		1.4	2.7	3.2	2.2
4. Salaries		63.7	-	-	
5. Transportation		7.7	-	-	
6. School Constr.		5.2	-	-	
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	9.6%	10.2%	9.3%	8.8%
1. Capital Outlay		9.6	6.7	8.3	8.8
2. Contingent Fund		-	3.5	1.0	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	8	9	6	5	3

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	-	-	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	31.2	89.0	3	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	68.8	2.2	5	1
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	8.8	-	1
	100.0%	100.0%	8	3

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" -" = aids not included.

IDAHO - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Idaho reported two state aids paid to local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 99.0% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 1.0% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Idaho reported two state aids for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 99.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. .3% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR IDAHO

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	99.0%	98.2%	98.3%	99.7%	99.7%
1. School Income		98.2	98.3	99.7	99.7
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	1.0%	1.8%	1.7%	.3%	.3%
1. Vocational			1.7	.3	.3
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	2	2	2	2	2

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	-	-	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	99.0	99.7	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	1.0	.3	1	1
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.0%	2	2

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

ILLINOIS - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Illinois reported eleven state aids paid to local school districts. 31.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 46.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 21.9% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Illinois reported sixteen state aids for local school districts. 22.9% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 61.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 15.1% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. .4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR ILLINOIS

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	31.5%	25.4%	23.5%	32.3%	22.9%
1. Common School Fund - Gen.		25.4	22.0	28.1	22.9
2. Jr. College		-	1.5	4.2	-
3. Rebates		.0			
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	46.6%	55.1%	59.4%	52.1%	61.7%
1. Common School Fund/Equalizing		55.1	59.4	52.1	61.7
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	21.9%	19.5%	17.1%	16.5%	15.1%
1. Handicapped		6.7	5.2	5.1	4.5
2. Transportation		5.2	4.3	3.4	3.4
3. Driver Training		-	3.6	1.6	1.3
4. Vocational Ed.		2.5	1.7	1.8	2.1
5. County Supt.		1.3	1.0	.7	.6
6. Military Grants		.7	.9	1.3	.9
7. Orphanage Aid		.5	.4	.4	.3
8. County Supvn.		.1	.1	.0	.0
9. State Housing		-	.0	1.0	.1
10. Institutional Rebates		-	.0	.0	.0
11. County Trustees		-	.0	.0	.0
12. Adult Ed.		-	-		.8
13. Gifted		-	-	1.2	1.1
14. School Lunch		2.5			
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	.4%
1. Special Ed. Facilities	-	-	-		.4
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	11	11	14	15	16

Summary of State support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of Aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	31.5%	22.9%	1	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	46.6	66.7	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	21.9	15.1	9	13
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	.4	-	1
	100.0%	100.1%	11	16

Note: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.
B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

INDIANA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Indiana reported four state aids paid to local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 1.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 98.6% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Indiana reported twelve state aids for local school districts. 3.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 1.9% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 7.04% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 89.3% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	-	-	4.9%	3.7%
1. Intangible Tax	-	-	-	4.9	3.7
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT		1.2%	.8%	1.5%	1.9%
1. School Support - other		1.2	.8	1.5	1.9
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	1.4%	1.8%	1.6%	6.24%	7.04%
1. Handicapped		1.4%	1.3%	1.30%	1.60%
2. Vocational Education		.3	.2	.50	.50
3. T.B. Tuition		.1	.0	.01	.00
4. State Property		-	.0	.03	.04
5. State Support - Corp. Tax		-	-	4.40	4.90
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	98.6%	97.0%	97.6%	87.4%	89.3%
1. School Support/Tuition		90.3	85.4	68.7	69.7
2. School Support/TSPN		6.7	8.4	5.6	5.4
3. School Support/Tax Relief		-	3.8	11.5	12.7
4. Contingency Funds		-	.0		-
5. School Support - Adult Ed.		-	-	.3	.3
6. School Support - Summer Ed.		-	-	1.3	1.2
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	4	6	9	12	12

Summary of State Support by type of aids:

TYPE	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	3.7%	-	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	-	1.9	-	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	1.4	7.04	3	5
Special-Purpose Equalizing	98.6	89.3	1	5
	100.0%	101.94%	4	12

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
"-" = aids not included

IOWA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Iowa reported six state aids paid to local school districts. 68.4% of the aid funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 19.9% were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants; 11.7% were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. No aid was paid for Special-Purpose Equalizing.

For the 1968-69 year Iowa reported ten state aids. 64.6% of the aid was for General-Purpose Equalizing; 26.0% for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 9.4% of the aid was for Special-Purpose Flat-Grant and less than .1% was provided for Special-Purpose Equalizing.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR IOWA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	68.4%	63.7%	64.2%	66.0%	26.0%
1. General Aid		63.2	63.6	65.7	3.5
2. Semi-annaul Appn.		.5	.6	.3	.1
3. Income Tax		-	-	-	22.4
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	11.7%	15.8%	17.4%	7.8%	64.6%
1. Supplemental Aid		15.8	17.4%	7.8	-
2. Equalization Aid		-	-	-	64.6
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	19.9%	20.1%	17.9%	25.7%	9.4%
1. Transportation		15.8	13.1	7.8	-
2. Handicapped		2.7	3.5	4.9	2.0
3. Vocational - Operation		1.6	1.3	10.6	3.5
4. Driver Ed.		-	-	2.4	1.0
5. Capital Outlay/Vocational		-	-	-	2.8
6. State Institutions		-	-	-	.1
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	.4%	.5%	.5%	.0%
1. Mining Aid			.3	.1	-
2. Emergency Aid			.2	.4	.0
TOTAL AIDS NUMBER	6	7	8	9	10

Supply of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	68.4%	26.0%	2	3
General-Purpose Equalizing	11.7	64.6	2	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	19.9	9.4	2	5
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	.0	0	1
	100.0%	100.0%	6	10

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
"- " = aids not included

KANSAS - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Kansas reported three state aids paid to local school districts. 3.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 94.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 1.8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Kansas reported seven state aids for local school districts. 8.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 86.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 5.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR KANSAS

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	3.5%	30.2%	24.5%	8.0%	8.4%
1. Sales Tax		27.1	22.7	6.8	6.8
2. Annual School Fund			3.1	1.2	1.6
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	94.7%	67.8%	72.9%	87.7%	86.4%
1. Elementary Finance		67.8	53.4		
2. H.S. Finance		-	19.5		
3. Foundation Fund		-	-	87.7	86.4
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	1.8%	2.0%	2.6%	4.3%	5.4%
1. Other Handicapped		.4	1.0	2.0	2.2
2. Retarded		.3	.8	(included above)	
3. Vocational		1.2	.5	.2	.4
4. Homebound		.1	.3	(included with handicapped)	
5. Driver Training		-	-	.7	.6
6. Jr. College		-	-	1.4	2.2
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	3	7	8	7	7

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grants	3.5%	8.4%	1	2
General-Purpose Equalizing	94.7	86.4	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	1.8	5.4	1	4
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.2%	3	7

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

KENTUCKY - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Kentucky reported six state aids paid to local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 9.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 90.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Kentucky reported two state aids for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 98.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 1.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR KENTUCKY

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	9.6%	16.9%	98.2%	98.3%	98.6%
1. Foundation Program					
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	90.4%	83.1%	1.8%	1.7%	1.4%
1. Free Textbook		2.7	1.8	1.7	1.4
2. Per Capita		79.5	-	-	-
3. Voc. Education		.9	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	6	4	2	2	2

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	-	-	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	9.6	98.6	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	90.4	1.4	5	1
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.0%	6	2

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

LOUISIANA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Louisiana reported ten state aids paid to local school districts. 44.8% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 14.9% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 40.3% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Louisiana reported sixteen state aids for local school districts. 2.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 82.1% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 15.5% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR LOUISIANA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	44.8%	43.3%	33.3%	2.7%	2.3%
1. Public School Fund		40.3	33.3	2.7	2.3
2. Interest Free School Fund		.1	.0	.0	.0
3. Serverance Tax		2.9			
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	14.9%	13.4%	51.4%	80.5%	82.1%
1. Public School Fund-Aid		13.4	51.1	80.5	82.1
2. Rapid Growing School System		-	.3	-	
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	40.3%	43.3%	15.0%	16.6%	15.5%
1. Teachers Special Salary Fund		18.7			
2. School Lunch Fund		10.5	10.4	4.0	3.9
3. Textbooks, Supplies		3.1	2.9	2.6	2.5
4. Crippled, except. children		.4	.7	.5	.5
5. Regular Vocational Ed.		.8	.5	.3	.3
6. Driver Education			.2	.1	.1
7. Adult Academic Ed.			.2	.1	.1
8. School Lunch Personnel			.1	-	-
9. Retirement Fund			-	8.9	7.9
10. Agri. Teachers				.1	.1
11. Food Preservation			-	-	.1
12. Interest on free school funds		-			.0
13. Special Vocational		.6			.0
14. ED. & Rec., youth		-			.0
15. Americanism		-			.0
16. NDEA		9.2			-
17. Cost of living					

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of Aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	44.8%	2.3%	2	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	14.9	82.1	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	40.3	15.5	7	14
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	99.9%	10	16
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	- .3%	.0%	-
1. Special Vocational Ed. (Facilities)		- .3	.0	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	10	11 12	12	16

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

MAINE - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Maine reported sixteen state aids paid to local school districts. 8.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 8.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 82.8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Maine reported fifteen state aids for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 80.9% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 5.5% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 13.6% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR MAINE

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	8.7%	-	-	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	8.5%	92.9%	94.0%	84.7%	80.7%
1. State Support-Foundation Program		92.9	94.0	84 7	80.9
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	82.8%	7.1%	5 5%	5.5%	5.5%
1. Supt. Salary-School Unions		2.7	1.7	.6	.1
2. Professional Credits Fund		1.6	1.0	.4	.0
3. State Vocational Ed. Fund		1.4	.9	.5	.4
4. Special Ed. Handicapped, Excep. child.		.3	.8	1.1	1.5
5. Driver Ed. Fund		-	.4	.3	.3
6. Evening Schools Fund		.4	.3	.2	.2
7. Interest to Plantations		.3	.3	.1	.1
8. Interest on Permanent Sch.		4	.1	.1	.0
9. Child of Private Tax-Exempt Inst.		-	.0	-	
10. Sec. Ed. of Island Child.		.0	.0	.0	.0
11. Temp. Resident Subsidy Fund		.0	.0	.0	
12. Unorgn'd Territory Funds		-	-	2 2	1.7
13. Tech. Vocational Centers		-	-	-	1.2
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	.5%	9.8%	13.6%
1. Supplement Loans Grants			.5	.2	.0
2. State Aid School Construction			.0	5.8	9.3
3. Supplement State Aid for Reorg. District			.0	3.8	4.3
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	16	10	15	16	15

Summary of state support by type of aids:

TYPE	PERCENT		NUMBER OF AIDS	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	8.7%	-	1	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	8.5	80.9	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	82.8	5.5	14	11
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	13.6	-	3
	100.0%	100.0%	16	15

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" -" = aids not included

MARYLAND - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Maryland reported nine state aids paid to local school districts. 43.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 46.0% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 5.0% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 5.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Maryland reported seven state aids for local school districts. 2.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 59.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 16.8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 21.2% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR MARYLAND

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	43.6%	45.8%	41.6%	5.0%	2.3%
1. Basic Aid-Classroom Unit		20.4	22.2	-	
2. Basic Aid Pupil Enrolled		25.2	18.9	2.2	
3. Jr. College Fund		.2	.5	2.8	2.3
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	46.0%	38.9%	41.6%	70.5%	59.5%
1. Equalization Fund - current		38.9	41.6	70.5	59.5
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	5.0%	11.5%	5 0%	16.3%	16.8%
1. Partial Salaries- Sch.Officials		3.4	3.2	-	
2 Ed. of Handicapped		.7	1.4	3.6	7.3
3. Gen. Public School Ass't Loan		5.0	.3	-	
4. Adult Education		.2	.1	.5	.3
5. TSPN FUND		-		11.7	8.9
6. Driver Ed.		-		.5	.3
7. Salary Suppl.		2.2			
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	5.4%	3.8%	11.8%	8.4%	21.2%
1. Sch. Bldg. Incentive		3.8	11.8	8.4	21.2
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	9	10	9	8	7

Summary of state support by type of aids:

TYPE	Percent		Number of Aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	43.6%	2.3%	2	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	46.0	59.5	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	5.0	16.8	5	4
Special-Purpose Equalizing	5.4	21.2	1	1
	100.0%	99.8%	9	7

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
"- " = aids not included

MASSACHUSETTS - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Massachusetts reported seven state aids paid to local school districts. None of the funds were for General Purpose Flat Grants. 73.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 23.8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 2.7% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Massachusetts reported six state aids for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 66.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 18.5% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 14.9% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR MASSACHUSETTS

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	73.5%	61.8%	51.2%	70.6%	66.6%
1. School Aid Fund		61.8	51.2	70.6	66.6
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	23.8%	26 8%	28.7%	15.2%	18.5%
1. Transportation Expense		6.6	9.0	7.7	8.4
2. Vocational Ed.		11.2	8.4	-	-
3 Ed. of Handicapped			3.8	4.5	7.1
4. School Lunch Fund		3.6	3.5	2.4	2.3
5. Ed. of Blind & Deaf		3.1	2.4	(included in Handicapped)	
6. State Wards' Fund		1.7	1.2	.6	.7
7. Supt. Salary		5	.4	-	
8. Sight-saving Classes		.1	.0	-	
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	2.7%	11.4%	20.1%	14.2%	14.9%
1. School Const. Grant		11.4	20.1	14.2	14.9
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	7	9	10	6	6

Summary of state support by type of aids:

TYPE	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	-	-	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	73.5	66.6	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	23.8	18.5	5	4
Special-Purpose Equalizing	2.7	14.9	1	1
	100.0%	100.0%	7	6

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

MICHIGAN - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Michigan reported thirteen state aids paid to local school districts. 44.2% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 51.8% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 4.0% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Michigan reported four state aids for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 94.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 5.7% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR MICHIGAN

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	44.2%	44.9%	19.5%	-	-
1. Primary School Interest		20.5	18.2	-	-
2. Jr. College Aid		23.6	1.3	-	-
3. Sales Tax Diversion		.8	-	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	51.8%	52.7%	77.0%	93.8%	94.3%
1. School Aid Fund		52.7	77.0	93.8	94.3
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	4.0%	2.4%	3.5%	6 2%	5.7%
1. Special Ed Fund		1.1	2.5	4.4	4.9
2. Jr. & Comm. College Capital outlay		-	.5	-	-
3. Vocational Ed. Fund		.6	.3	-	-
4. City School Dist. Fund		.2	.2	.5	-
5. Adult Ed. Fund		.2	.0	-	-
6. Underprivileged		-	-	.8	.3
7. County Trainable		-	-	.5	-
8. Intermediate Dist.		-	-	-	.5
9. Rural Ag. School		.2			
10. Visiting Teacher		.1			
11. Co. Normal		.0			
12 Apprentice Trg.		.0			
13. Work Camp		.0			
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	13	13	8	5	4

Summary of State Support by type of aids:

TYPE	Percent		Number of Aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	44.2%	-	2	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	51.8	94.3	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	4.0	5.7	10	3
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.0%	13	4

Note: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

MINNESOTA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Minnesota reported twelve state aids paid to local school districts. 70.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 14.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 15.0% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Minnesota reported fourteen state aids for local school districts. In 1967-68 7.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 76.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 15.8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. .3% of the funds were for Special Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR MINNESOTA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	70.4%	75.4%	61.3%	8.8%	7.3%
1. Foundation Program-Basic		62.3	48.4	-	-
2. Income Tax		8.0	6.5	4.3	3.5
3. Endowment Fund		5.1	6.0	4.5	3.8
4. Jr. College Fund		-	.4	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	14.6%	11.1%	24.0%	76.1%	76.7%
1. Foundation Program -Equalizing		11.1	24.0	76.1	76.7
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	15.0%	13.1%	14.1%	14.8%	15.8%
1. Transportation		8.4	8.7	8.2	7.3
2. Handicapped		1.4	1.9	2.9	3.3
3. Vocational		1.5	1.7	2.3	3.8
4. Gross Earnings		1.0	1.1	.8	.6
5. School Lunch		.3	.3	.2	.2
6. Tax Exempt Land		.5	.3	.2	.1
7. Airport Refund		-	.1	.1	.1
8. Common School Land		-	.0	-	-
9. H.S. Teacher Training		.0	.0	-	-
10. Decreasing Assessed		-	-	-	.3
11. County Equalization		-	-	.1	.1
12. State Trust Lands		-	-	.0	.0
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	.4%	.5%	.3%	.3%
1. Emergency Aid	-	.4	.5	.3	.3
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	12	12	15	13	14

Summary of State Support by Type of Aids:

Type	Percent		Number of Aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	70.4%	7.3%	3	2
General-Purpose Equalizing	14.6	76.7	2	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	15.0	15.8	7	10
Special-Purpose Equalizing	.0	.3	0	1
	100.0%	100.1%	12	14

NOTE: A. In some cases, grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

MISSISSIPPI - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Mississippi reported four state aids paid to local school districts. 45.8% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 3.1% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 5.3% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Mississippi reported seven state aids for local school districts. 8.8% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 82.0% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 9.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR MISSISSIPPI

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	45.8%	40.1%	10.6%	11.9%	8.8%
1. Common School Fund		39.9	10.6	4.4	3.2
2. Homestead Exempt.		-	-	7.5	5.6
3. Chickasaw Fund		.2			
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	45.8%	39.9%	73.4%	77.0%	82.0%
1. Minimum Foundation		39.9	73.4	77.0	82.0
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	3.1%	14.5%	16.0%	11.1%	9.4%
1. State Public School Bldg.			13.4	5.8	4.2
2. Vocational Ed. Fund		3.4	2.3	3.2	3.3
3. Except. Children's Fund			.2	-	
4. Chickasaw School Fund			.1	.1	.1
5. Textbook Fund				2.0	1.6
6 Negro Teachers		8.3	-	-	-
7. Negro Tspn		2.8	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	5.3%	5.5%	-	-	-
1. School Bldg.		5.5			
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	4	7	6	7	7

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	45.8%	8.8%	1	2
General-Purpose Equalizing	45.8	82.0	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	3.1	9.4	1	4
Special-Purpose Equalizing	5.3	-	1	-
	100.0%	100.0%	4	7

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
"- " = aids not included

MISSOURI - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Missouri reported sixteen state aids paid to local school districts. 57.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 16.8% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 25.6% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Missouri reported thirteen state aids for local school districts. 60.0% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 11.2% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 28.8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR MISSOURI

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	57.6%	70.9%	57.9%	58.1%	60.0%
1. State School Monies Fund & Junior College		70.9*	57.9	56.0	56.7
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	16.8%	7.8%	15 0%	13.2%	11.2%
1. State Sch. Monies Fund (Level 1 and 2)		7.8	15.0	13.2	11.2
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	25.6%	21.3%	27.1%	28.7%	28.8%
1. Transportation		5.9	8.3	8.8	7.7
2. State Sch. Monies/Teachers			7.9	9.2	9.4
3. Free Textbook Aid		6.0	5.7	6.1	4.0
4. Reorganized Bldg. Aid		4.0	2.2	.9	.8
5. Exceptional Pupil Aid		1.5	2.1	2.7	3.9
6. Vocational Ed. Fund		.8	.5	.7	2.5
7. City Teacher Training		-	.2	.3	.5
8. Building Maintenance		-	.1	-	-
9. Orphan Aid		.0	.0	.0	.0
10. Central Building Aid		.0	.0	.0	.0
11. High School Teacher Trng.		.3	.0	-	-
12. Bldg. Abandonment		.1	-	-	.0
13. H.S. Tuition		2.6	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	16	14	13	12	13

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of Aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	57.6%	60.0%	3	2
General-Purpose Equalizing	16.8	11.2	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	25.6	28.8	12	10
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.0%	16	13

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

* Represents three aids.

MONTANA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Montana reported three state aids paid to local school districts. 26.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 66.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing Grants. 6.9% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Montana reported six state aids for local school districts. 27.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 67.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 5.2% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR MONTANA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	26.4%	39.1%	29.6%	18.4%	27.4%
1. Interest & Income Fund		39.1	29.6	18.4	27.4
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	66.7%	53.9%	63.1%	76.7%	67.4%
1. State Foundation Program		53.9	63.1	76.7	67.4
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	6.9%	7.0%	7.3%	4.9%	5.2%
1. Transportation		6.7	7.1	4.0	3.5
2. Vocational Ed.		.3	.2	.2	1.3
3. Driver Training		-	-	.6	.3
4. Impact Aid				.1	.1
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	3	4	4	6	6

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	26.4%	27.4%	1	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	66.7	67.4	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	6.9	5.2	1	4
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.0%	3	6

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" -" = aids not included

NEBRASKA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Nebraska reported ten aids paid to school districts. 98.5% of the aid funds were appropriated for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. The balance of 1.5% was for General-Purpose Equalizing.

For the 1968-69 fiscal year Nebraska reported eight aids. 78.1% of the aid was paid for General-Purpose Equalizing; 15.1% for General-Purpose Flat-Grant; and 6.7% for Special-Purpose Flat-Grant. No Special-Purpose Flat-Grant. No Special-Purpose Equalizing aids were provided.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR NEBRASKA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	82.1%	83.1%	76.0%	15.1%
1. Temporary School Fund/Census		55.5	46.1	35.1	7.3
2. Insurance Premium Tax		-	21.7	29.2	5.4
3. Temporary Sch. Fund/District Constant		17.1	15.3	11.7	2.4
4. Temp. Sch. Fund (Lieu of tax)		9.5	-	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	1.5%	.0%	-	-	78.1%
1. School Foundation & Equalization		-	-	-	78.1
2. Aid to districts		.0	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	98.5%	17.9%	16.9%	24.0%	6.7%
1. Temporary School Fund (Tax)		-	7.1	7.8	1.4
2. Special Ed. Fund		10.2	6.9	9.7	3.4
3. Armed Forces Tuition		1.8	1.7	-	-
4. Vocational Ed. Fund		2.6	1.2	.9	.2
5. Normal Training (Teacher)		1.0	.0	-	-
6. Driver Education		-	-	5.6	1.7
7. Disaster aid		1.5			
8. Mallery Act - Voc. Ed.		.8	-		
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	10	10	8	7	8

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	.0%	15.1%	0	3
General-Purpose Equalizing	1.5	78.1	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	98.5	6.7	9	4
Special-Purpose Equalizing	.0	.0	0	0
	100.0%	100.0%	10	8

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = iess than .05%
"-" = aids not included

NEVADA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Nevada reported seven state aids paid to local school districts. .9% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 95.9% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 3.2% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Nevada reported one state aid for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 100.0% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing Grants, and none of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants or Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR NEVADA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	.9%	93.8%	-	-	-
1. Distributive School Fund		83.5			
2. H.S. Fund - Basic		10.3			
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	6.2%	99.3%	98.7%	100.0%
1. Distributive School Fund (Reg.)		-	99.3	98.7	100.0
2. Emergency Support		.2	-	-	-
3. School Reserve		2.1	-	-	-
4. Rural aid		.3	-	-	-
5. H.S. Fund Equalizing		3.6	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	95.9%	.0%	.7%	1.3%	-
1. Dist. Sch. Fund (Financial Aid)			.7	.8	-
2. Dist. Sch. Fund (Special Portion)		-	-	.5	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	3.2%	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	7	7	2	3	1

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	.9	-	1	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	95.9	100.0	4	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	3.2	-	2	-
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.0%	7	1

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
"- " = aids not included

NEW HAMPSHIRE - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of New Hampshire reported six state aids paid to local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 55.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 44.6% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants and none of these funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year New Hampshire reported eleven state aids for local school districts. 10.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 45.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 40.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants and 3.2% for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	-	-	22.3%	10.7%
1. Sweepstake aid		-	-	22.3	10.7
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	55.4%	82.4%	58.0%	40.4%	45.7%
1. Foundation Aid Fund		82.4	58.0	39.1	45.7
2. Aid to needy District				1.3	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	44.6%	17.6%	33.8%	33.9%	40.4%
1. School Bldg. Construction Aid		-	27.4	27.6	29.4
2. Ed. of Deaf Children		-	4.0	3.5	3.2
3. Area Vocational School		4.3	2.1	.6	.5
4. Ed. Unorganized Areas		.6	.3	.1	.1
5. Retarded		-	-	1.3	1.6
6. Handicapped		-	-	.7	.6
7. Emotionally Disturbed				.1	.2
8. Reorganization Aid		-	-	-	4.8
9. Supervision Fund		12.7	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	8.2%	3.4%	3.2%
1. Statewide Supervision Fund		-	8.2	3.4	3.2
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	6	4	6	11	11

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of Aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	10.7%	-	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	55.4%	45.7	2	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	44.6	40.4	4	8
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	3.2	-	1
	100.0%	100.0%	6	11

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

NEW JERSEY - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of New Jersey reported fourteen state aids paid to local school districts. 43.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 35.8% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 20.8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants and none of these funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1966-67 year New Jersey reported fourteen state aids for local school districts. 43.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 30.1% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 13.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 12.9% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR NEW JERSEY

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	43.4%	40.9%*	51.5%	43.5%	Not Included
1. Minimum Aid Fund			51.5	43.5	
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	35.8%	33.8%	21.5%	30.1%	
1. Equalizing Aid Fund		29.8	21.5	30.1	
2. Deficiency Aid		3.6			
3. Aid to Needy Districts		.4			
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	20.8%	25.3%**	10.9%	13.4%	
1. Transportation			7.3	5.9	
2. Atypical Pupils			2.4	2.4	
3. Gen/Child Study			.6	-	
4. Vocational Evening School			.3	.2	
5. Salaries-County Supt.			.2	.2	
6. Industrial School			.1	.0	
7. Large School Aid			-	2.3	
8. Adult Education				.1	
9. Maladjusted				1.4	
10. Vocational Education				.9	
11. Teacher Education				.0	
12. State Property					
13. Evening School-Foreign Born					
14. County AV Centers					
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANTS	-	-	16.1%	12.9%	
1. Sch. Bldg. Aid			15.0	12.8	
2. Sch. Bldg. Capital Reserve			.9	-	
3. Emergency Aid-Needy			.2	.1	
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	14	15	11	14	

Summary of State Support by Type of Aids:

Type	Percentages		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	43.4%	43.5%	3	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	35.8	30.1	3	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	20.8	13.4	8	10
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	12.9	-	2
	100.0%	99.9%	14	14

* (Represents 4 Aids)
** (Represents 8 Aids)

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

NEW MEXICO - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of New Mexico reported six state aids paid to local school districts. 86.1% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 1.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 12.5% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year New Mexico reported ten state aids for local school districts. 80.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 19.7% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR NEW MEXICO

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	86.1%	88.4%	89.6%	84.9%	80.3%
1. Equalization Fund		64.7	66.0	66.1	63.0
2. Current School Fund		23.7	23.6	18.8	17.3
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	1.4%	.9%	-	-	-
1. Public School Aid		.9	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	12.5%	10.7%	9.8%	14.8%	19.7%
1. Transportation		8.6	7.6	6.4	6.5
2. Textbook Fund		2.1	2.2	1.7	2.0
3. Teacher Expr.		-	-	3.9	3.5
4. Qualification		-	-	1.5	1.4
5. Local Incentive		-	-	1.0	
6. Driver Ed.		-	-	.3	.3
7. Chief's Discretionary		-	-	-	.3
8. Minimum Support		-	-	-	.3
9. Instructional Personnel		-	-	-	5.4
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	.6	.2	-
1. Public School Aid			.6	.2	
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	6	5	5	9	10

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of Aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	86.1%	80.3%	2	2
General-Purpose Equalizing	1.4	-	1	-
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	12.5	19.7	3	8
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.0%	6	10

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

NEW YORK - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of New York reported eight state aids paid to local school districts. 38.0% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 56.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 2.8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 2.6% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year New York reported seven state aids for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 92.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 7.3% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR NEW YORK

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	38.0%	31.9%	5.7%	-	-
1. Attendance Fund		31.9	5.7	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	56.6%	60.9%	81.7%	99.1%	92.7%
1. Equalization Fund		60.9	81.7	99.1	92.7
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	2.8%	2.0%	5.3%	.9%	7.3%
1. Phy. Handicapped/Non-English Speaking		.1	2.9		-
2. Extended School Services			1.3	.9	
3. School Program		1.8	1.1		.7
4. Textbooks			-	-	1.3
5. Coop Services					2.1
6. Co-Vocational					.1
7. Urban Aid					2.6
8. Experimental		-	-	-	.5
9. Tuition		.1	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	2.6%	5.2%	7.3%	-	-
1. Transportation		3.6	4.7	-	-
2. Building Fund		1.5	2.6	-	-
3. Former Dist. Indebtedness		.1	.0	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	8	8	8	2	7

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	38.0%	-	1	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	56.6	92.7	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	2.8	7.3	3	6
Special-Purpose Equalizing	2.6	-	3	-
	100.0%	100.0%	8	7

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than 05%
" -" = aids not included

NORTH CAROLINA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of North Carolina reported five state aids paid to local school districts. 98% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 2% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year North Carolina reported eight state aids for local school districts. 92.0% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 8.0% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR NORTH CAROLINA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	98.0%	66.4%	86.7%	92.7%	92.0%
1. 9-months School Fund		66.4	86.7	92.7	92.0
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	2.0%	10.5%	6.8%	7.3%	8.0%
1. Vocational Ed. Fund		1.6	2.1	2.4	3.1
2. Free Textbook Fund		1.4	1.7	2.1	2.3
3. School Bus Fund		1.0	1.6	.9	.8
4. Construction Sch. Bldgs. ADM		.7	.9	-	.4
5. Const. - Sch. Bldgs. Per City		5.8	.5	-	-
6. Const - Sch. Bldgs. ADM			.0	-	-
7. Driver Trg.				1.3	1.4
8. Mentally Handicapped				.3	-
9. School Lunch				.1	-
10. Prof. Improvement				.1	.0
11. T.V. Fund				.1	.0
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	23.1%	6.5%	-	-
1. Construction -Sch. Bldgs ADM		8.7	-	-	-
2. Construction -Sch. Bldgs. Equalization		14.4	6.5	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	5	8	8	9	8

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	98.0	92.0	1	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	2.0	8.0	4	7
	100.0%	100.0%	5	8

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" -" = aids not included

NORTH DAKOTA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of North Dakota reported six state aids paid to local school districts. 17.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 5.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 44.6% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 32.7% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year North Dakota reported four state aids for local school districts. 10.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 86.9% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 2.6% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR NORTH DAKOTA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	17.4%	54.5%	49.2%	9.9%	10.5%
1. Equalization Fund		37.5	32.4	-	-
2. State Apportionment-census		17.0	16.8	9.9	10.5
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	5.3%	42.4%	43.3%	87.4%	86.9%
1. Equalization Fund/Elem.		27.4	25.9	-	-
2. Equalization Fund/ High School		11.0	17.4	-	-
3. Foundation Program		-	-	87.4	86.9
4. Emergency Aid		4.0	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	44.6%	3.1%	2.4%	2.4%	2.6%
1. Special Education Fund		1.0	1.3	1.6	1.8
2. Vocational Education		2.1	1.1	.8	.8
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZATION-GRANT	32.7%	-	5.1%	.3%	-
1. Emergency State Aid		-	5.1	.3	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	6	7	7	5	4

Summary of State Support by Type of Aids:

TYPE	Percentages		Number of Aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	17.4%	10.5%	1	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	5.3	86.9	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	44.6	2.6	3	2
Special-Purpose Equalizing	32.7	-	1	-
	100.0%	100.0%	6	4

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

OHIO - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Ohio reported seven state aids paid to local school districts. 65.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 29.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 1.9% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 3.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Ohio reported eight state aids for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 94.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 5.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR OHIO

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	65.4%	64.5%	-	-	-
1. Foundation - Uniform Distr.		64.3			
2. Perm. School Fund		.2			
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-FUND	29.3%	29.9%	97.7%	99.03%	94.6%
1. Foundation program		29.9	97.7	99.03	94.6
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	1.9%	2.1%	.1%	.10%	5.4%
1. Permanent School Fund		2.1	.1	.10	.1
2. Disadvantaged					1.9
3. Adult Literacy					.0
4. Ed. T.V.					.1
5. Non-public auxillary services					2.1
6. Driver Ed.		-	-	-	1.1
7. Mentally Retarded		-	-	-	.1
8. Handicapped		1.5	-	-	-
9. Vocational		.6	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	3.4%	3.5%	2.2%	.90%	-
1. Subsidy-Sch. Buses		1.1	1.7	.90	
2. Tuition Emergency Asst.		-	.5	-	-
3. Plant Rehab.		1.2			
4. Emergency Building Needs		1.2			
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	7	8	4	3	8

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	65.4%	-	2	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	29.3	94.6	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	1.9	5.4	2	7
Special-Purpose Equalizing	3.4	-	2	-
	100.0%	100.0%	7	8

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding

121

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " aids not included

OKLAHOMA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Oklahoma reported eight state aids paid to local school districts. 11.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 79.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 8.7% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Oklahoma reported six state aid for local school districts. 36.0% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 59.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 5.0% of the funds were for Special Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR OKLAHOMA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	11.7%	18.8%	19.8%	21.3%	36.0%
1. Basic Aid Fund		13.7	13.9	-	
2. Gen'l Apport. Fund		5.1	5.9	3.5	4.0
3. Incentive aid				17.8	32.0
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	79.6%	74.7%	74.1%	69.5%	59.7%
1. Equalization Aid		74.7	74.1	69.5	59.7
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	8.7%	6.5%	6.1%	9.2%	5.0%
1. State Textbook Fund		3.5	3.0	3.1	3.0
2. Vocational Ed. Fund		2.2	2.2	5.1	1.0
3. Handicapped Children		.5	.7	1.0	1.0
4. Orphan Tuition		.3	.2	-	1.0
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	8	7	7	6	5

Summary of State Support by Type of Aids:

Type	Percent		Number of Aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	11.7	36.0	2	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	79.6	59.7	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	8.7	5.0	5	3
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.7%	8	5

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

OREGON - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Oregon reported nine state aids paid to local school districts. 75.0% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 16.0% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 9.0% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Oregon reported sixteen state aids for local school districts. 69.32% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 13.90% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 16.71% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants and none of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR OREGON

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	75.0%	86.8%	72.2%	70.6%	69.32%
1. Basic School Fund - Adm.		68.4	68.3	62.8	55.90
2. Basic School Fund-Growth			2.9	2.7	2.38
3. Common School Fund		.9	.9	2.3	2.55
4. Basic School Fund, Comm. College			.1	2.8	8.49
5. Basic Support - Teacher Unit		17.5			
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	16.6%	6.1%	17.1%	15.7%	13.9%
1. Basic Sch. Support Fund-Foundation		5.3	17.1	15.7	13.9
2. Basic Sch. Support Fund-Emergency		.8			
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	9.0%	7.1%	10.1%	13.7%	16.71%
1. Basic Sch. Support-Transport.		5.4	7.6%	6.7	6.77
2. Basic Sch. Fund-Handicapped		1.4	1.5	1.5	1.54
3. Vocational Ed. Fund		.3	.4	.1	.11
4. Basic Sch. Fund-Mentally retarded			.3	1.3	1.27
5. Basic School Fund-Curriculum improv.			.2	.1	-
6. Basic Sch. Fd. Educ. advanced			.1	.1	.02
7. Community College - Construction			-	2.6	5.10
8. Student Driver			-	.6	.61
9. Sp. Aids - T.E. Land			-	.4	.11
10. Ed. Development			-	.3	
11. Disadvantaged Children					.62
12. Aid to individuals					.06
13. Special Schools					.50
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	.6%	-	-
1. Basic School Fund-Emergency			.6	-	
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	9	8	12	15	16

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	75.0	69.32	3	4
General-Purpose Equalizing	16.0	13.90	2	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	9.0	16.71	4	11
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	99.93%	9	16

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" -" = aids not included

PENNSYLVANIA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Pennsylvania reported ten state aids paid to local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 84.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 4.5% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 11.2% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Pennsylvania reported seventeen state aids for local school districts. 1.9% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 71.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 15.8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 11.0% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR PENNSYLVANIA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	1.0%	-	-	1.9%
1. Community College	-	-	-	-	1.9
2. Closed Sch. Support		1.0	-	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	84.3%	83.6%	74.6%	71.3%	71.3%
1. Pub. School Fund/Basic Program		83.5	74.6	71.3	71.3
2. Distressed Districts		.1	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	4.5%	4.3%	4.9%	9.6%	15.8%
1. Pub. Sch. Ed./special fund		.4	2.2	4.7	4.6
2. Pub. Sch. Fund/Closed School			.8	.5	.3
3. County Supervision Fund		.8	.6	.7	.5
4. Med. & Dental Exam. Fund		1.3	.6	2.2	1.5
5. Vocational Ed. Fund		.7	.4	1.5	1.7
6. Miscell. Subsidies (Spec. prog.)		1.1	.3	.0	1.5
7. Migrant workers			-	-	.0
8. Sewage			-	-	.0
9. In lieu of taxes					.0
10. Bonus					5.7
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	11.2%	11.1%	20.5%	19.1%	11.0%
1. Obligations to Sch. Bldg. Auth.		1.8	7.6	7.5	6.3
2. Transportation Fund		6.0	5.7	5.3	4.1
3. Public Sch. Fund/supplemental payment			3.6	4.2	-
4. Public Sch. Fund/tuition reimbursment		2.6	1.7	.5	-
5. Sch. Nurses Fund			1.2	-	-
6. State Supp. Ed. & Recreat. Ext.(Homebound)		.7	.3	1.0	.1
7. Driver Ed. Fund			.3	.5	.4
8. Aid to Finan. Distressed Dist.			.1	.1	.1
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	10	13	16	13	17

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	1.9	-	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	84.3	71.3	2	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	4.5	15.8	4	10
Special-Purpose Equalizing	11.2	11.0	4	5
	100.0%	100.0%	10	17

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" =less than .05%
"-" = aids not included

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Rhode Island reported ten state aids paid to local school districts. 14.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 4.0% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 81.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Rhode Island reported four state aids for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 83.2% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 5.1% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 9.7% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR RHODE ISLAND

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	14.6%	13.3%	44.0%	-	-
1. Pub. Sch. Foundation Fund		-	44.0	-	-
2. Per Capita Aid		11.2	-	-	-
3. H.S. Aid		2.1	-	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	4.0%	3.5%	9.4%	90.03%	83.2%
1. Public Sch. Foundation Prog. Fund		-	8.0		
2. Equalization Fund		3.5	1.4		
3. School Operation Fund		-	-	90.03	83.2
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	81.4%	82.9%	45.6%	-	7.1%
1. Teachers Salaries Fund		74.0	36.0		
2. Teachers Money, Per Capita Aid			4.9		
3. Education of Handicapped Fund		.2	2.9		2.4
4. H.S. Aid & Consolidated Sch. Fund			.8		
5. Supervision Fund		1.1	.4		
6. Vocational Grants & Claims		1.0	.4		
7. Medical Inspection		.3	.1		
8. Fed. Apprenticeship Training		.1	.1		
9. Disadvantaged Children			-		4.7
10. H.S. TSPN		1.5	-		
11. School Lunch		4.7	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	.3%	1.0%	9.97%	9.7%
1. Transporting Children		-	.9		
2. Permanent Sch. Fund		.3	.1		
3. School Housing Aid		-	-	9.97	9.7
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	10	12	13	2	4

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	14.6	-	2	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	4.0	83.2	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	81.4	5.1	7	2
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	9.7	-	1
	100.0%	100.0%	10	4

E: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

SOUTH CAROLINA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of South Carolina reported nine state aids paid to local school districts. 4.2% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants or Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 95.8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year South Carolina reported eighteen state aids for local school districts. 100.0% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR SOUTH CAROLINA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	4.2%	3.9%	-	-	-
1. Teacher's Salary Fund-Supervision		3.9			
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	95.8%	96.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
1. Teacher's Salary Fund		51.4	66.3	66.3	66.5
2. Pub. Sch. Bldg. Fund		35.7	15.6	9.0	9.7
3. Transportation Fund		6.2	7.2	6.2	6.2
4. Maintenance & Operation Fd.			4.0	4.6	3.9
5. Teacher's Salary Fund - Sup. & Overhead			4.0	2.3	2.9
6. Vocational Ed. Fund		1.7	1.9	3.4	3.1
7. County Sch. Admin. Fund		.3	.3	.2	.2
8. School Lunch Fund		.3	.2	.4	.1
9. School Lunch Supervis. Fund		.2	.2	.1	.1
10. Visiting Teacher's Fund		.2	.2	.1	.1
11. Adult Ed. Fund		.1	.1	1.1	1.0
12. Teacher's Salary Fund-Principals			-	2.3	2.6
13. Textbooks				1.7	2.1
14. Driver Ed.				.1	.2
15. Audiovisual				.1	.1
16. State Surplus				2.1	
17. Area Vocational		-	-	-	.8
18. Trade School		-	-	-	.5
19. Mentally & Phy. Handicapped		-	-	-	.0
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	9	10	11	16	18

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1948-60	1968-69
General- Purpose Flat-Grant	4.2%	-	1	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	95.8	100.0%	8	18
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.0%	9	18

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

3

SOUTH DAKOTA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of South Dakota reported four state aids paid to local school districts. 93.68% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 6.32% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants or Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year South Dakota reported eight state aids for local school districts. 75.02% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 18.8% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 6.11% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR SOUTH DAKOTA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-54	57-58	66-67	68-69
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	93.68%	96.47%	96.10%	74.14%	75.02%
1. State Aid--Appropriations	54.00	53.45	55.15	52.95	53.81
2. Permanent Sch. Fund Approp.	39.68	43.02	40.95	21.19	21.21
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING GRANT	6.32%	3.39%	2.52%	19.83%	18.87%
1. T. Base Depletion	5.87	2.56	2.23	2.22	2.11
2. Indian Lands	.45	.67	-	-	-
3. Public Shooting	-	.16	.29	.34	.42
4. Foundation - Equal	-	-	-	17.27	16.34
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	.13%	1.38%	6.04%	6.11%
1. Special Education	-	.13	1.38	1.42	.79
2. Vocational	-	-	-	1.43	.82
3. Transportation	-	-	-	3.19	4.50
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	4	6	5	8	8

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	93.68	75.02	2	2
General-Purpose Equalizing	6.32	18.87	2	3
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	.0	6.11	0	3
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.0%	4	8

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%

" - " = aids not included

TENNESSEE - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Tennessee reported six state aids paid to local school districts. 19.8% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 63.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 3.2% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 13.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Tennessee reported six state aids for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 89.9% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 4.7% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 5.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR TENNESSEE

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	19.8%	22.0%	14.8%	-	-
1. Sch. Gen. Aid Gund		22.0	14.8	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	63.6%	59.5%	71.6%	90.0%	89.9%
1. Annual Sch. Program - Equalizing		59.5	71.6	90.0	89.9
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	3.2%	8.7%	4.5%	3.9%	4.7%
1. Textbook Fund		6.0	2.4	1.8	2.0
2. Vocational Ed. Fund		2.0	1.5	1.3	1.8
3. Sick Leave-Teacher's Fund		.5	.4	.2	.3
4. Mentally Retarded Fund		.2	.2	.2	-
5. Special Ed.		-	-	.4	.6
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	13.4%	9.8%	9.1%	6.0%	5.4%
1. Capital Outlay Fund		9.8	9.1	6.0	5.4
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	6	7	7	7	6

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	19.8%	-	1	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	63.6	89.9	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	3.2	4.7	3	4
Special-Purpose Equalizing	13.4	5.4	1	1
	100.0%	100.0%	6	6

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
"-" = aids not included

TEXAS - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Texas reported three state aids paid to local school districts. 52.1% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 44.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 3.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Texas reported three state aids for local school districts. 40.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 56.8% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 2.7% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR TEXAS

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	52.1%	60.7%	56.6%	37.5%	40.6%
1. Available School Fund		60.7	56.6	37.5	40.6
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	44.5%	35.8%	40.9%	59.3%	56.8%
1. Foundation Sch. Prog. Fund		35.8	40.9	59.3	56.8
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	3.5%	2.5%	3.2%	2.7%
1. State Textbook Fund		3.5	2.5	3.2	2.7
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	3.4%	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	3	3	3	3	3

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	52.1	40.6	1	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	44.5	56.8	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	2.7	-	1
Special-Purpose Equalizing	3.4	-	1	-
	100.0%	100.1%	3	3

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Utah reported eight state aids paid to local school districts. 87.2% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 12.8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants or General-Purpose Flat-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Utah reported eleven state aids for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 88.2% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 6.2% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 5.8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR UTAH

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANTS	87.2%	86.2%	92.3%	90.3%	88.2%
1. State Uniform Sch. Fund/ Basic & Leeway		86.2	92.3	90.3	88.2
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	12.8%	3.0%	3.0%	6.2%	6.2%
1. School Lunch Fund		2.7	1.8	1.8	1.9
2. Driver Ed. Fund			1.1	.7	.6
3. Vocational Ed. Fund		.3	.1	.4	.3
4. Continuing Sch. Bldg. Aid			-	1.6	1.5
5. Extended Sch. Year			-	.9	.9
6. IMC Fund			-	.8	.6
7. Data Processing					.3
8. Ed. T.V.					.1
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	10.8%	4.7%	3.5%	5.8%
1. Sch. Building Fund		10.8	4.7	3.5	3.3
2. TSPN					2.5
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	8	4	5	8	11

NOTE: Retirement funds are not included in aids.

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	-	-	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	87.2	88.2%	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	12.8	6.2	7	8
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	5.8	-	2
	100.0%	100.2%	8	11

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
"- " = aids not included

VERMONT - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Vermont reported seven state aids paid to local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 96.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 3.7% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Vermont reported five state aids for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 81.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 18.3% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR VERMONT

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	96.3%	81.5%	60.9%	75.7%	81.5%
1. Gen. State Aid Fund		81.5	60.9	75.7	81.5
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	3.7%	18.5%	39.1%	24.3%	18.3%
1. Capital Outlay Fund		12.3	33.0	-	
2. Handicapped Children		3.7	3.8	7.2	4.6
3. Vocational Educ. Fund		2.1	2.0	3.4	1.0
4. School Bldg. Fund			.1	12.4	11.5
5. Standardization of Schools		.2	.1	-	
6. War Orphans Fund		.0	0.0	-	
7. Fort Ethan Allen Inst. Fund		-	0.0	-	
8. Driver Ed.		-	-	1.2	1.2
9. Community School Building		.1	-	.1	
10. Visual Ed.		.1			
11. Sight & Hearing		.0			
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	7	9	8	6	5

Summary of State support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	-	-	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	1.6	81.5	2	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	98.4	18.3	10	4
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	99.8%	12	5

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

VIRGINIA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Virginia reported twelve state aids paid to local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 1.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 98.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Virginia reported twenty state aids for local school districts. 21.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 64.9% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 13.7% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. .1% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR VIRGINIA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	-	-	-	21.3%
1. Sales Tax		-	-	-	21.3
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	1.6%	5.4%	9.8%	80.6%	64.9%
1. Minimum Educ. Prog. Fund		5.2	9.8	-	-
2. Basic School Fund		-	-	80.6	64.9
3. Discretionary		.2	-	-	-
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	98.4%	94.6%	90.0%	19.3%	13.7%
1. Teacher's Salaries		64.3	59.6	-	-
2. Salary Equalization Fund		11.4	13.7	-	-
3. Pupil Transportation Fund		9.5	7.6	5.0	3.0
4. Vocational Educ. Fund		5.6	5.6	4.4	3.1
5. Local Supervision Fund		1.4	1.0	.7	.5
6. Special Education Fund		.3	.8	2.1	2.0
7. Twelve-months Principals' Fund		.6	.5	.5	.3
8. Local Administration Fund		.5	.4	.3	.2
9. Sick Leave for Teachers' Fund		.5	.4	.6	.3
10. Free Textbook Fund		.4	.3	1.4	.8
11. Adult Education Fund		.1	.1	.0	.1
12. Teaching Scholarship			-	1.2	.8
13. Pilot Study				.0	.0
14. Ed. T.V.				.3	.3
15. Library Fund				.5	.4
16. Summer School				.5	.6
17. IN-SVC Fund				.5	.3
18. Driver Ed.				.6	.3
19. Guidance				.7	.7
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	.2%	.1%	.1%

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	21.3	-	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	1.6	64.9	2	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	98.4	13.7	10	17
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	.1	-	1
	100.0%	100.0%	12	20
1. Discretionary Fund - continuency	-	.2	.1	.1
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	12	13	13	20	20

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
"-" = aids not included

WASHINGTON - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Washington reported seven state aids paid to local school districts. 87.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 7.0% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. .8% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 4.9% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Washington reported seven state aids for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 82.6% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 13.1% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. 4.3% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR WASHINGTON

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	87.3%	60.3%	61.3%	-	-
1. School Fund for Basic Support		60.3	61.3	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	7.0%	20.4%	20.3%	76.8%	82.6%
1. Equalization of Dist. Tax Proceeds		12.6	13.0	-	
2. State Sch. Equalization Fund		7.7	7.3	-	
3. Basic Support Portion		-	-	76.8	82.6
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	.8%	.8%	1.4%	17.9%	13.1%
1. Educa. of Handicapped		.8	1.4	4.2	4.9
2. Community College		-	-	5.5	
3. TSPN		-	-	4.8	6.1
4. Vocational-Tech. School Fund		-	-	2.5	1.2
5. State Institutions		-	-	.6	.7
6. Adult Ed.		-	-	.3	.2
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	4.9%	18.5%	17.0%	5.3%	4.3%
1. School Building Construction Fd.		18.5	17.0	5.3	4.3
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	7	5	5	8	7

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	87.3	-	2	-
General-Purpose Equalizing	7.0	82.6	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	.8	13.1	3	5
Special-Purpose Equalizing	4.9	4.3	1	1
	100.0%	100.0%	7	7

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

WEST VIRGINIA - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of West Virginia reported six state aids paid to local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 98.5% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 1.5% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants and none of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year West Virginia reported twelve state aids for local school districts. None of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 46.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 53.5% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR WEST VIRGINIA

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	2.7%	-	-	-
1. State Aid - Supplemental		2.7	-	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	98.5%	95.7%	87.3%	55.8%	46.7%
1. State Aid Fd./ Foundation Prog.		95.7	87.3	55.8	46.7
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	1.5%	1.6%	12.7%	44.2%	53.5%
1. Teachers' Salaries-Supp. Instr. Portion			11.3	34.9	40.9
2. Vocational Ed.		.6	.5	1.0	1.3
3. Crippled Children		.2	.3	.6	.5
4. Free Textbook		.4	.3	.2	.3
5. School Lunch		.3	.2	.3	.3
6. County Supt.		.1	.1	.1	.0
7. Orphange Fund			.0	.0	.0
8. Increased Enrollment			-	.3	.3
9. Supporting Services			-	5.7	8.9
10. Comprehensive Ed.			-	1.1	.9
11. Safety Education				-	.1
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	6	7	8	11	12

Summary of state support by type of aids:

TYPE	PERCENT		NUMBER OF AIDS	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	-	-	-
General- purpose Equalizing	98.5	46.7	1	1
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	1.5	53.5	5	11
General-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.2%	6	12

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

WISCONSIN - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Wisconsin reported five state aids paid to local school districts. 85.4% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing Grants. 14.6% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants or General-Purpose Flat-Grants.

For the 1968-69 year Wisconsin reported eight state aids for local school districts. 3.8% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 76.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. 19.4% of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR WISCONSIN

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	53.5%	49.6%	24.8%	3.8%
1. Pub. Sch. Fund - Flat-Grant		51.9	49.6	24.8	3.8
2. Common School Fund		1.6	-	-	-
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	85.4%	23.0%	33.0%	56.7%	76.7%
1. Pub. Sch. Fund/Equalizing		23.0	33.0	56.7	76.7
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	14.6%	22.5%	17.3%	18.5%	19.4%
1. Transportation Fund		15.0	9.8	6.4	7.5
2. Educ. for Handicapped		5.5	5.0	6.0	5.6
3. Vocational & Adult Educ.		1.8	1.2	3.8	4.0
4. Common Sch. Fund (library books)		-	1.0	.6	.6
5. Tuition Fund		.2	[illegible]	1.0	1.0
6. Driver Ed.		-	-	.7	.7
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	1.0%	.1%	-	-
1. Transportation Fund		1.0	.1 (included in Gen. Purpose)		
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	5	8	8	8	8

Summary of state support by type of aids:

Type	Percent		Number of aids	
	1949-50	1968-69	1949-50	1968-69
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	3.8	-	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	85.4	76.7	3	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	14.6	19.4	2	6
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	99.9%	5	8

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" - " = aids not included

WYOMING - STATE AIDS AND EXPENDITURES

Review of State Aids

In 1949-50 the state of Wyoming reported five state aids paid to local school districts. 95.3% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 4.7% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants or Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

For the 1966-67 year Wyoming reported two state aids for local school districts. 17.1% of the funds were for General-Purpose Flat-Grants. 82.9% of the funds were for General-Purpose Equalizing-Grants. None of the funds were for Special-Purpose Flat-Grants or Special-Purpose Equalizing-Grants.

TABULATION OF STATE AIDS FOR WYOMING

PURPOSE AND TITLE	49-50	53-4	57-8	66-7	68-9
GENERAL PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	95.3%	96.5%	17.1%	17.1%	(Not included in 68-69 report)
1. Common School Land Income		25.7	17.1	17.1	
2. Aid to Public Schools		2.8			
3. State Tax School Fund		68.0			
GENERAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	4.7%	3.5%	82.9%	82.9%	
1. School Foundation Program		-	82.9	82.9	
2. School Equalization		3.5			
SPECIAL-PURPOSE FLAT-GRANT	-	-	-	-	
SPECIAL-PURPOSE EQUALIZING-GRANT	-	-	-	-	
TOTAL NUMBER OF AIDS	5	4	2	2	

Summary of State Support by Type of aids:

Type	Percentages		Number of Aids	
	1949-50	1966-67	1949-50	1966-67
General-Purpose Flat-Grant	95.3%	17.1%	4	1
General-Purpose Equalizing	4.7	82.9	1	1
Special-Purpose Flat-Grant	-	-	-	-
Special-Purpose Equalizing	-	-	-	-
	100.0%	100.0%	5	2

NOTE: A. In some cases grand totals do not total 100% due to rounding.

B. ".0%" = less than .05%
" -" = aids not included

APPENDIX A

NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL FINANCE PROJECT

Roe L. Johns, Project Director

Kern Alexander, Associate Director

Richard Rossmiller, Finance Specialist

Floyd Christian, Commissioner of Education
Florida, Administering State

PROJECT COMMITTEE

Edgar Morphet
University of California

James Alan Thomas
University of Chicago

William McLure
University of Illinois

Erick Lindman
U.C.L.A.

James A. Kelly
Columbia University

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

James Gibbs
U. S. Office of Education

Eugene McLoone
National Educational Association

Henry Cone
Education Commission of the States

Will Myers
Advisory Commission of
Intergovernmental Relations

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

(Chief State School Officers)

Floyd T. Christian, Florida
Ira Polley, Michigan
Duane J. Mattheis, Minnesota
Newell J. Paire, New Hampshire
James E. Allen, Jr.,
New York
Dale Parnell, Oregon
J. H. Warf, Tennessee
J. W. Edgar, Texas
T. H. Bell, Utah

(State Coordinators)

Herman O. Myers, Florida
Phillip T. Frangos, Michigan
S. Walter Harvey, Minnesota
Paul R. Fillion, New Hampshire
John W. Polley, New York
Lloyd L. Hogan, New York
Delos D. Williams, Oregon
T. B. Webb, Tennessee
Warren Hitt, Texas
Walter D. Talbot, Utah

Program Administrators

U. S. Office of Education
Harry Phillips
James Gibbs

APPENDIX B

STATE AGENCY CONTACT PERSON

State	Person
Alabama	W. H. Kimbrough
Arizona	Jim Showers
Arkansas	H. Z. Snell
California	Robert J. Clemo
Colorado	Stanley A. Leftminch
Connecticut	Maurice J. Ross
Delaware	Edward J. Moynohan
Florida	Elridge R. Collins
Georgia	O. H. Joiner
Idaho	Allen P. Jeffries
Illinois	A. K. Evans
Indiana	Gerald C. Carmony
Iowa	D. J. Gilliland
Kansas	U. H. Budd
Kentucky	James Melton
Louisiana	George B. Benton, Jr.
Maine	Asa A. Gordon
Maryland	Dr. Q. L. Earhart
Massachusetts	Dr. Everett G. Thistle
Michigan	Roger Boline
Minnesota	S. Walter Harvey
Mississippi	W. S. Griffin
Missouri	H. Kenneth Kirchner
Montana	John P. Campbell
Nebraska	M. L. Christensen
Nevada	John R. Gamble
New Hampshire	William B. Baston
New Jersey	Edward W. Kilpatrick
New Mexico	Leonard DeLayo
New York	Francis E. Griffin
North Carolina	Dr. A. Craig Phillips
North Dakota	A. R. Nestoss
Ohio	John M. Parsons
Oklahoma	Dr. Charles L. Weber
Oregon	Lloyd Thomas
Pennsylvania	Dr. Herbert E. Bryan
Rhode Island	Edward F. Wilcox
South Carolina	R. W. Burnette
South Dakota	James C. Schooler
Tennessee	T. B. Webber
Texas	Leon R. Graham
Utah	Dr. Maurice Barnett
Vermont	Daniel G. O'Connor
Virginia	J. G. Blount, Jr.
Washington	Norman Westline
West Virginia	William Coffman
Wisconsin	Alden W. Kingston
Wyoming	Lewis Finch

APPENDIX C

A GLOSSARY OF SELECTED TERMS

One of the major difficulties in a discussion of school finance and reorganization is the vast number of terms used and the manner in which the terms are employed. This section presents a generalized glossary of terms which are relevant to the area of school finance and reorganization. Terms included in the glossary have been used in the sections related to organization and legislation, intermediate units, state aids and the basic statistics.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT - A geographic area which, for specified public school purposes, is under the supervision or control of a single board of education and/or administration officer. This may be a state, intermediate, or local basic unit.[1]

2. ATTENDANCE AREA - An administrative unit or subdivision of it consisting of the territory from which children legally may attend a given school building or school center.[2]

3. COMMON SCHOOL - An obsolescent designation for the traditional 8-year public elementary school providing a foundation program for education.[2]

4. CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT - A term limited in some states to districts, usually rural, maintaining a single attendance unit while in other states it applies to any school district serving territory once served by two or more districts.[2]

5. COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT - A unit of school administration in which school affairs of the county as a whole (sometimes with specified exceptions) are controlled by a county board of education.[2]

6. COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT - An elected or appointed administration officer in a county who is charged with the general supervision of specified schools in the respective counties of the state in regard to matters of government, courses of instruction and general conditions of the schools in the county.

7. DISSOLUTION OF DISTRICT - The breaking up of a consolidation through legal process, with a return of each district that formed the original consolidation to the independent status that existed before the consolidation took place.[2]

8. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT - A school district for which no provision is made for public school work beyond the elementary grades.[2]

9. EQUALIZING AIDS - Aids which are distributed by formulas and procedures giving recognition to local financial ability and seek to raise the level of expenditures for education in the less wealthy districts while providing proportionately greater financial assistance to the less wealthy districts.[3]

10. FLAT GRANT AIDS - Aids which are usually allocated to all participating districts on an equal basis without regard to local financial ability. These aids are usually called matching or reimbursement and seek to raise the level of expenditures in all districts, both rich and poor.[3]

11. GENERAL PURPOSE AIDS - Aids which are allocated to boards of education with very little instruction as to the use to be made of the funds. The local board of education is at liberty to use the funds for the general program of education. No exact purpose is specified in the legislation other than the requirement to use the money for providing a program of education in the community.[3]

12. HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT - A district organized and administered to provi[illegible] education on the secondary level only.[2]

13. INCENTIVE AIDS - A general purpose or special purpose aid which is provided to districts which reorganize and meet such minimum standards as may be established by the state as part of the law or through the state department of education.

14. INTERMEDIATE ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT - A unit smaller than the state which exists primarily to provide consultation, advisory, or statistical services to local basic administrative units or to exercise certain regulatory and inspectoral functions over local basic administrative units. An intermediate unit may operate schools and contract for school services, but it does not exist primarily to render such services. Such units may or may not have taxing power.[4]

15. LOCAL BASIC ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT - An administrative unit at the local level which exists primarily to operate public schools or to contract for public school services. Normally, taxes can be levied against such units for school purposes. These units may or may not be coterminous with county, city, or town boundaries. This term is used synonymously with the term "school district".[1]

16. NON-OPERATING SCHOOL DISTRICT - A district which has failed to maintain a public school for a specified amount of time.

17. REGULATORY FUNCTION - A function performed by some level of school administration to insure that the rules and regulations for the operations of schools within a state are carried out in the schools operating within the jurisdiction of the respective administrative unit.

18. REVENUE RECEIPTS - Additions to assets which do not incur an obligation that must be met at some future date and do not represent exchanges of property for money.[5]

19. SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION - The act of legally changing the designation of a school district; changing the geographical area of a school district or incorporating a part or all of a school district with an adjoining district.[2]

20. SCHOOL SYSTEM - All the schools operated by a given board of education or central administrative authority.[2]

21. SCHOOL UNION - A joining of two or more local school units (districts, township, or town, for example) for some educational purpose such as maintenance of an enlarged attendance unit, supervisory unit, or administrative unit or for the provision of special services.[2]

22. SERVICE FUNCTION - A function performed by some level of school administration to enhance or extend the educational services available to schools or pupils within the jurisdiction of the administrative unit.

23. SPECIAL PURPOSE AIDS - Identifies the aids approved by laws which indicate the exact purpose for which money shall be expended by local boards of education or for which the money is provided. Funds may be allocated to local school boards to help with expenditures for transportation, for the physically handicapped children, for rehabilitation of school buildings, for adult education, for textbooks, for health services, and for school lunches.[3]

24. SPECIAL SCHOOL DISTRICT - A school district incorporated by a special act of the state legislature.[2]

25. STATE AID FOR EDUCATION - Any grant made by a state government for the support of education.[6]

26. SUPERVISORY UNION - An administrative unit used in the New England states and New York to permit two or more local administrative units to be served by the same chief administrative officer. For all practical purposes the basic units within the supervisory union maintain their separate identities for all purposes except in this sharing of a school administrator.[2]

27. UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT - A school district providing a public school program from kindergarten or grade 1 to grade 12.[2]

FOOTNOTES

[1]United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Standard Terminology for Instruction in Local and State School Systems, (Washington, D.C.: USOE, 1967).

[2]Dictionary of Education, Second Edition, Carter V. Good, Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

[3]Hutchins, Clayton D. and Munse, Albert R., Public School Finance Program of the United States, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955 (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Misc. No. 22)

Washington D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966. (State Educational Records and Reports Series Handbook II).

[4]United States Office of Education, The Common Core of State Educational Information, State Educational Records and Reports Series Handbook I (Washington, D.C.: USOE, 1953).

[5]Reason, Paul L., Foster, Emery M. and Will, Robert F., The Common Core of State Educational Information, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1953. (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, State Educational Records and Reports Series: Handbook I, Bulletin 1953, No. 3).

[6]Reason, Paul L., and White, Alpheus L., Financial Accounting for Local and State School Systems.

APPENDIX D

PROJECT STAFF - UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Clifford P. Hooker, Project Director, is Chairman of the Division of Educational Administration at the University of Minnesota. Former positions include: Acting Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Minneapolis; Assistant Dean, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh; and Visiting Professor, University of Southern California, Los Angeles. His writings include: Equal Treatment to Equals, A New Structure for Public Schools in the Kansas City and St. Louis Metropolitan Areas and Cooperation Among School Districts in a Metropolitan Area: A Case Study, Chapter XV, 1968 NSSE Yearbook. Professor Hooker has served on the faculty at the University of Minnesota for the past twelve years. His Ed.D. degree was earned at Indiana University.

Van D. Mueller, associate director of this project, has been on the faculty of the University of Minnesota since 1964, and currently holds the position of Associate Professor and Assistant Chairman in the Division of Educational Administration. His writings include co-authorship of Equal Treatment to Equals - A New Structure for Public Schools in the Kansas City and St. Louis Metropolitan Areas and Cooperative Federalism - A Model for the Organization of Education in Metropolitan Areas. He has served as a teacher and administrator in the public schools, State Department of Education finance consultant, and as a consultant to local and state education agencies. Dr. Mueller received the Ed.D. degree from Michigan State University in 1964.

The following Research Assistants at the University of Minnesota have contributed to the project:

John Feda has served as high school teacher, high school principal and superintendent of schools in Minnesota for nineteen years. He received his B.A. from St. John's University and his M.A. from the University of Minnesota. His masters thesis topic was "Reorganization of the Forty-four Elementary Districts in the Alexandria High School Area." Currently he is completing his Doctor of Education Degree at the University of Minnesota. His thesis topic is "An Analysis of Intermediate Units as School Property Tax Bases to Meet the Fiscal Disparities Found in the Support of Education."

James Lindsay was, prior to this assignment, a member of the faculty of the College of St. Thomas, where he designed and was chairman of the Department of Quantitative Methods. He was also Director of the Computing Center. After completing his Doctor of Philosophy in Education he will work full-time as a management consultant. Mr. Lindsay received his undergraduate training at the University of Glasgow, Scotland, and worked in industry in that country before coming to the U.S.A. in 1959. During the past few years of his tenure at the College of St. Thomas, he acted as a consultant to management and to the Industrial Relations Center of the University of Chicago and was involved in several national and international studies.

David L. Wettergren is currently on leave of absence from the school district of Rochester, Minnesota, where he serves as a junior high school principal. Mr. Wettergren received his B.A. from Gustavus Adolphus College in 1961 and his M.A. from the University of Minnesota in 1966. In addition to both teaching and administrative experience he has served as an Interm Principal at Mayo High School,

Rochester, under sponsorship of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Currently he is completing his Doctor of Education Degree at the University. His thesis topic is "An Analysis of Selected State Legislation that has Encouraged School District Reorganization."

John Young is on sabbatical leave from Hopkins, Minnesota, School District No. 274. For the past ten years he has been employed by the school district as Director of Business Affairs. He received a B.A. Degree in Business Administration from the University of Minnesota in 1958. In 1964 and 1969 Master of Arts Specialist Degrees were received in Educational Administration. Mr. Young is currently pursuing the Ed.D Program. The subject of his thesis is "A Study of the Equalization of Education Costs and Selected Variables."

APPENDIX E

BASIC STATISTICAL PROFILE

The following tables were derived from many sources. Among these were the following publications of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare: Digest of Educational Statistics and Statistics of State School Systems: Biennial Surveys. The Handbook of Labor Statistics,published by the Department of Commerce, was also a valuable means of gaining information. The tables were compiled from these sources and then sent to each contact person in the forty-eight states considered with the request that they correct and where possible fiil in the missing items. Unfortunately the information requested was not available in many states and occasionally the definitions used required some interpretation by individuals. The resulting corrected tables are reproduced in this appendix.

ALABAMA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	2,901	3,102	3,085	3,267	3,376	3,604
School Age (6-20)	784	791	800	844	901	903
Public School Enrollments K-12	651	679	733	787	843	860
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	552	587	649	709	771	788
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	108	108	112	114	117	120
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only	3	3	1	1	1	
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	105	105	111	113	116	118
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99						
Enrollment 100-499	1	2	0	1	0	0
Enrollment Over 500	107	105	112	113	117	118
Total Number of Schools	3,700	3,105	2,681	2,364	2,043	1,622
Number of 1-Teacher Schools	1,089	654	393	207	91	7
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$97.70	$129	$164	$194	$228	$344
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.6%	1.7%	2.2%	4.5%	3.7%	19.3%
State	74.2%	75.7%	76.9%	72.8%	71.8%	60.1%
Local and Other	24.2%	22.6%	20.9%	22.7%	24.50%	20.6%

ARKANSAS
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	1,937	1,895	1,771	1,786	1,902	2,200
School Age (5-17)	506	480	490	474	498	505
Public School Enrollments K-12	404	417	418	424	448	455
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	344	351	360	373	402	434
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	1,589	425	423	422	415	394
Non-Operating					1*	4*
Elementary Only	1,062	11	25	18	17	12
Secondary Only		2				
Elem. and Sec. Only	527	412	398	404	397	378
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99				17	16	11
Enrollment 100-499				213	206	195
Enrollment Over 500				192	193	188
Total Number of Schools	3,718	2,201	2,244	1,705	1,552	1,357
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	1,450	414	330	110	51	5
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$93	$123	$160	$225	$282	$430
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	6.6%	2.7%	3.2%	3.1%	2.4%	2.4%
State	62.4%	51.1%	45.2%	48.6%	49.1%	52.3%
Local and Other	31.0%	46.2%	51.6%	48.3%	48.5%	45.3%

*Children attending school in other districts.

ARIZONA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	704	804	1,031	1,302	1,516	
School Age (5-17)	169	193	249	350	418	
Public School Enrollments K-12	124	172	223	302	381	390
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	112	139	191	258	333	358
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	342	329	298	305	306	297
Non-Operating				8		
Elementary Only	278	265		224		220
Secondary Only	64	64		71		77
Elem. and Sec. Only				1		
Sec. and Comm. College				1		
Elem., Sec., and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99				89		74
Enrollment 100-499				97		106
Enrollment Over 500				119		117
Total Number of Schools	491	530	529	611	666	708
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	87	79	53	41	31	25
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$203	$263	$312	$404	$476	$636
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	2.8%	3.2%	7.9%	10.8%	7.2%	5.8%
State	46.4%	27.9%	30.9%	34.1%	32.8%	34.9%
Local and Other	50.8%	69.0%	61.1%	55.1%	59.9%	59.3%

CALIFORNIA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	10,064	11,638	13,581	15,863	18,209	19,782
School Age (5-17)	1,814	2,198	2,928	3,692	4,577	5,035
Public School Enrollments K-12	1,534	1,965	2,635	3,368	4,089	4,564
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	1,441	1,834	2,391	3,196	3,901	4,457
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	2,466	2,018	1,849	1,686	1,545	1,156
Non-Operating	117	6	6	0	6	2
Elementary Only	2,026	1,700	1,493	1,316	1,123	738
Secondary Only	236	222	214	206	194	121
Elem. and Sec. Only	37	65	83	107	156	229
Sec. and Community College	23	21	18	15	2	0
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College	10	10	12	12	8	6
Other	17	20	23	30	56	60
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			719			197
Enrollment 100-499			532			258
Enrollment Over 500			629			703
Total No. of Schools	4,192	4,409	4,887	5,532	6,199	6,735
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	840	495	338	244	174	102
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$212	$261	$344	$409	$472	$630
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.3%	4.1%	4.6%	2.1%	2.7%	6.6%
State	47.5%	39.0%	41.1%	40.9%	37.6%	34.9%
Local and Other	51.2%	56.9%	54.3%	57.0%	59.7%	58.5%

COLORADO
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	1,199	1,381	1,560	1,754	1,918	2,056
School Age (5-17)	256	282	351	440	504	540
Public School Enrollments K-12	215	253	327	393	480	515
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	185	211	275	345	432	478
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	1,644	1,333	972	522	222	181
Non Operating				101	9	
Elementary Only	1,455		736	193	11	3
Secondary Only	48		40	12		
Elem. and Sec. Only	141		190	210	202	178
Community College			6	6	6	11
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			712	291	24	11
Enrollment 100-499			186	141	83	76
Enrollment Over 500			74	90	95	94
Total Number of Schools	2,016	1,585	1,188	1,270	1,240	1,205
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	872	460	259	142	47	22
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. K-12	$188	$253	$306	$396	$472	$597
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.5%	3.1%	6.3%	6.5%	6.4%	7.3%
State	20.8%	18.1%	18.6%	19.5%	23.4%	27.1%
Local and Other	77.7%	78.8%	67.1%	74.0%	70.2%	65.6%

DELAWARE
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	300	330	396	446	480	
School Age (5-17)	58	64	82	108	124	
Public School Enrollments K-12	44	50	65	81	100	
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	38	44	57	73	91	
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	118	118	103	94	86	50
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only				53		
Secondary Only				3		
Elem. and Sec. Only				38		
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99				39		
Enrollment 100-499				20		
Enrollment Over 500				35		
Total Number of Schools	237	198	157	201	204	
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	48	39	25	20	16	
Current Expenditures in Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$204	$317	$365	$450	$550	
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	3.0%	1.5%	3.0%	2.1%	4.4%	
State	86.4%	88.2%	83.7%	82.5%	80.3%	
Local and Other	10.6%	10.3%	13.3%	15.4%	15.3%	

CONNECTICUT
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	1,989	2,038	2,209	2,535	2,715	2,965
School Age (7-16)	355	369	455	582	657	527
Public School Enrollments K-12	258	305	388	476	570	635
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	231	268	350	425	504	590
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	173	172	174	175	177	174
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only			76	66	63	53
Secondary Only	3	2	4	7	8	9
Elem. and Sec. Only	170	170	94	102	105	112
Sec. and Comm. College					1	
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			2	2		1
Enrollment 100-499			56	57		35
Enrollment Over 500			116	116		138
Total Number of Schools	880	827	915	955	1,032	1,146
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	115	31	21	5	2	2
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.M. (K-12)	$217	$291	$340	$436	$541	$652
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	2.2%	2.4%	4.9%	3.1%	3.2%	4.3%
State	24.8%	22.0%	26.3%	34.6%	32.7%	30.0%
Local and Other	73.0%	75.5%	68.7%	62.3%	64.1%	65.7%

FLORIDA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	2,430	2,925	3,657	4,952	5,531	6,202,000
School Age (5-17)	497	577	757	1,140	1,329	
Public School Enrollments K-12	448	556	755	1,020	1,247	1,427
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	369	459	632	871	1,082	1,217
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	67	67	67	67	67	67
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only						
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	67	67	67	67	53	41
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College					14	26
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99						
Enrollment 100-499			1			
Enrollment Over 500			66	67	67	67
Total No. of Schools	2,369	1,732	1,691	1,860	1,983	1,955
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	420	164	63	34	15	6
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$161	$206	$258	$318	$394	$564
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	2.69%	4.03%	3.62%	3.67%	4.63%	11.75%
State	55.42%	51.40%	55.43%	56.57%	52.95%	42.17%
Local and Other	41.89%	44.57%	40.95%	39.76%	42.42%	46.08%

GEORGIA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	3,167	3,481	3,646	3,943	4,217	4,511
School Age (5-17)	817	847	961	1,061	1,146	1,224
Public School Enrollments K-12	699	752	863	949	1,057	1,174
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	582	638	747	821	931	999
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	189	204	200	197	196	193
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only						
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	189	201	196	197	196	193
Sec. and Community College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College			4			
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99						
Enrollment 100-499			3	1	1	1
Enrollment Over 500			197	196	195	192
Total Number of Schools	4,299	3,300	2,866	2,280	2,231	1,915
Number of 1-Teacher Schools	1,758	806	509	13	9	0
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$104	$165	$194	$253	$317	$469
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	5.8%	9.7%	8.0%	7.4%	7.1%	13.6%
State	57.9%	64.7%	64.8%	64.0%	64.2%	54.6%
Local and Other	36.3%	25.6%	27.3%	28.6%	28.7%	31.8%

IDAHO
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	586	590	609	667	687	690
School Age (5-17)	134	144	162	186	193	
Public School Enrollments K-12	115	130	145	163	176	
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	103	115	131	147	162	
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	959	281	174	156	116	117
Non-operating				4		2
Elementary Only	789	153	69	45	11	9
Secondary Only	24	5	0		0	
Elem. and Sec. Only	146	123	104	105	105	106
Sec. and Community College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other	2	2	2	2	3	2
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			64	44		
Enrollment 100-499			45	43		
Enrollment Over 500			65	69		
Total No. of Schools	959	719	654	635	628	564
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	270	151	81	48	23	14
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$163	$211	$246	$290	$350	$441
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	2.0%	4.6%	5.9%	8.5%	8.1%	
State	23.6%	18.4%	25.6	27.7%	30.7%	
Local and Other	74.4%	77.0%	68.5%	63.8%	61.2%	

ILLINOIS
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	8,348	8,806	9,316	10,081	10,382	10,715
School Age (5-17)	1,520	1,606	1,935	2,309	2,529	2,698
Public School Enrollments K-12	1,137	1,224	1,486	1,788	2,082	2,215
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	989	1,084	1,309	1,514	1,792	1,999
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	9,459	3,413	2,212	1,689	1,439	1,315
Non-Operating						6
Elementary Only	8,724	2,781	1,590	1,067		724
Secondary Only	648	326	288	250		209
Elem. and Sec. Only	87	306	323	353		382
Sec. and Community College				11		
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College			11	4		
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99				512		176
Enrollment 100-499				618		446
Enrollment Over 500				555		687
Total No. of Schools	9,546	4,331	5,242	4,513	4,567	4,858
Number of 1-Teacher Schools	7,126	1,526	922	237	15	5
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$223	$291	$353	$438	$512	$737
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	2.3%	1.6%	3.6%	2.5%	2.9%	4.8%
State	15.9%	15.4%	24.0%	20.7%	23.0%	21.8%
Local and Other	81.8%	83.0%	72.4%	76.8%	74.1%	73.4%

INDIANA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	3,917	4,069	4,335	4,662	4,779	5,106
School Age (5-17)	791	820	985	1,156	1,246	1,333
Public School Enrollments K-12	658	750	879	989	1,115	1,181
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	553	639	742	863	982	1,106
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	1,090	1,115	1,086	928	669	395
Non-Operating					189	25
Elementary Only	378		422	271	111	45
Secondary Only	6		2	3	4	3
Elem. and Sec. Only	706		661	610	365	332
Sec. and Community College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			181	113	14	11
Enrollment 100-499			608	485	146	85
Enrollment Over 500			297	330	320	296
Total Number of Schools	3,038	2,999	3,042	2,645	2,345	2,176
Number of 1-Teacher Schools	375	300	141	48	21	0
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$217	$253	$291	$369	$450	$610
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.5%	1.5%	2,7%	3.0%	2.7%	3.7%
State	39.6%	36.2%	33.5%	29.9%	32.8%	28.1%
Local and other	58.9%	62.3%	63.8%	67.1%	64.5%	68.2%

IOWA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	2,612	2,619	2,712	2,758	2,755	2,774
School Age (5-17)	505	542	614	680	707	705
Public School Enrollments K-12	464	495	550	598	644	658
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	402	431	492	538	579	617
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	4,711	4,649	3,958	2,022	1,164	458
Non-Operating				899	437	7
Elementary Only	3,847	3,809	3,150	552	202	1
Secondary Only		2				
Elem. and Sec. Only	864	838	792	555	459	455
Sec. and Community College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College			16	16	16	1
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			3,180	1,416	170	1
Enrollment 100-499			594	299	169	117
Enrollment Over 500			184	307	336	338
Total Number of Schools	7,984	6,778	6,347	4,568	2,307	463
Number of 1-Teacher Schools	5,631	4,384	2,932	863	224	1
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$208	$261	$299	$348	$457	
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.6%	1.5%	2.8%	4.1%	3.6%	4.0%
State	13.9%	14.7%	13.2%	12.0%	10.0%	29.0%
Local and Other	84.5%	83.8%	83.0%	83.9%	86.4%	67.0%

KANSAS
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	1,895	1,951	2,060	2,178	2,180	2,265
School Age (5-17)	372	392	453	525	563	566
Public School Enrollments K-12	334	370	434	479	496	548
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	276	319	381	441	474	474*
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	5,643	3,704	3,344	2,610	1,851	337
Non-Operating	1,238	356	261	328	184	1
Elementary Only	3,752	2,737	2,485	1,708	1,085	6
Secondary Only	350	324	326	326	301	5
Elem. and Sec. Only	303	287	258	234	268	325
Sec. and Community College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College			13	13	13	0
Other				1		
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			2,826			2
Enrollment 100-499			415			51
Enrollment Over 500			103			275
Total Number of Schools	4,708	4,050	3,394	3,328	2,452	1,949
Number of 1-T acher Schools	3,090	2,275	1,631	790	329	0
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$191	$246	$294	$389*	$445*	$579*
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.6%	3.8%	6.1%	5.2%	5.4%	8.1%
State	11.4%	22.4%	23.2%	19.2%	20.6%	32.3%
Local and Other	87.0%	73.8%	70.6%	75.6%	74.0%	59.6%

* Counting K=½

KENTUCKY
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	2,856	2,910	2,991	3,038	3,126	3,208
School Age (5-17)	715	699	784	798	831	845
Public School Enrollments K-12	546	569	598	631	676	706
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	455	482	535	567	610	639
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	246	230	224	212	204	199
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only	10	7	7	6	6	5
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	236	223	216	206	198	194
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College			1			
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99						
Enrollment 100-499	48	36	31	21	16	15
Enrollment Over 500	198	194	193	191	188	184
Total No. of Schools	6,035	4,990	4,068	3,089	2,528	1,772
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	3,462	2,799	2,093	1,244	695	235
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$112	$151	$168	$233	$314	$500
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	8.3%	8.7%	8.4%	7.1%	6.6%	17.6%
State	42.1%	38.5%	35.9%	45.8%	55.6%	45.4%
Local and Other	49.6%	52.8%	55.7%	47.1%	37.8%	37.0%

LOUISIANA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	2,591	2,747	2,927	3,257	3,415	3,714*
School Age (5-17)	629	655	762	893	966	1,060
Public School Enrollments K-12	442	514	599	693	785	863
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	381	452	532	619	708	759
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	66	66	66	66	66	66
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only						
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	66	66	66	66	66	66
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99						
Enrollment 100-499						
Enrollment Over 500	66	66	66	66	66	66
Total No. of Schools	2,840	2,297	2,033	1,866	1,884	1,901
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	788	359	107	13	10	2
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$145	$237	$282	$372	$390	$541
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	8.8%	3.5%	4.6%	4.2%	4.8%	11.4%
State	60.9%	70.9%	63.0%	70.2%	66.0%	61.0%
Local and Other	30.3%	25.6%	32.4%	25.6%	29.2%	27.6%

*Estimated 1969

MAINE
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	898	895	920	969	986	1,004
School Age (5-17)	195	193	214	240	251	257
Public School Enrollments K-12	152	171	176	195	215	233
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	140	145	164	182	204	215
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	500	492	498	461	457	307
Non-Operating	30			35	45	57
Elementary Only	349	294	327	261	259	131
Secondary Only	8		5	3	3	3
Elem. and Sec. Only	113	198	166	162	150	116
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec., and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			208	180		47
Enrollment 100-499			219	188		76
Enrollment Over 500			71	93		127
Total Number of Schools	1,859	1,503	1,337	1,184	1,078	962
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	728	514	326	199	118	34
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$133	$181	$222	$283	$358	488
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	2.3%	2.4%	5.2%	5.9%	6.0%	2.6%
State	26.8%	22.0%	27.1%	25.8%	28.2%	29.6%
Local and Other	70.9%	75.5%	67.7%	68.3%	65.8%	67.8%

MARYLAND
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	2,155	2,437	2,775	3,101	3,352	3,729
School Age (5-17)	414	480	614	770	874	997
Public School Enrollments K-12	302	383	495	596	722	826
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	266	331	438	534	649	761
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	24	24	24	24	24	24
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only						
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	24	24	21	16	16	10
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec., and Comm. College			3	8	8	14 *
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99						
Enrollment 100-499						
Enrollment Over 500	24	24	24	24	24	24
Total Number of Schools	1,107	1,026	1,009	1,068	1,147	1,215
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	161	75	35	19	10	3
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$193	$243	$297	$393	$478	706
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	2.6%	3.7%	8.3%	7.0%	6.0%	7.9%
State	40.7%	40.6%	32.6%	34.2%	33.8%	31.5%
Local and Other	56.7%	55.7%	59.1%	58.8%	60.2%	60.6%

* Includes 4 districts which operate one area community college

MASSACHUSETTS
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	4,638	4,724	4,820	5,149	5,296	
School Age (5-17)	848	856	982	1,160	1,256	1,335
Public School Enrollments K-12	591	657	766	861	996	1,080
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	521	573	689	793	907	1,016
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	351	351	351	376	392	408
Non-Operating				8	8	13
Elementary Only	119	122	111	76	139	156
Secondary Only				24	39	54
Elem. and Sec. Only	232	229	238	265	204	183
Sec. and Comm. College					0	0
Elem., Sec., and Comm. College			2		2	2
Other					0	0
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			37	44	30	25
Enrollment 100-499			100	95	98	82
Enrollment Over 500			214	237	256	288
Total Number of Schools	2,280	2,129	2,243	2,370	2,434	2,356
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	128	69	66	7	4	17
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$214	$267	$328	$409	$534	618
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.4%	1.8%	3.5%	5.3%	4.8%	6.1%
State	12.6%	18.3%	21.2%	19.9%	21.5%	19.1%
Local and Other	86.0%	79.9%	75.3%	74.8%	73.7%	74.8%

MICHIGAN
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	6,216	6,540	7,358	7,823	8,031	
School Age (5-17)	1,296	1,348	1,677	1,990	2,168	
Public School Enrollments K-12	998	1,135	1,369	1,625	1,853	
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	897	1,014	1,264	1,458	1,708	
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	5,186	4,736	3,491	2,099	1,536	721
Non-Operating				48		
Elementary Only	4,191	3,723		1,465		
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	995	1,013		570		
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec., and Comm. College				15		
Other				1		
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99				1,297		
Enrollment 100-499				296		
Enrollment Over 500				506		
Total Number of Schools	5,543	4,503	5,633	4,928	4,418	
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	2,952	2,538	1,900	943	547	
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$198	$267	$330	$415	$477	
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.9%	1.1%	2.6%	2.8%	2.7%	
State	54.5%	55.4%	48.5%	43.2%	42.7%	
Local and Other	43.6%	43.5%	48.9%	54.0%	54.5%	

MINNESOTA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	2,934	3,006	3,187	3,414	3,492	3,635
School Age (5-17)	598	637	747	867	930	
Public School Enrollments K-12	482	518	606	672	768	872
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	417	458	542	659	720	817
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	7,518	6,018	3,633	2,581	1,996	1,161
Non-Operating	2,418	2,245	1,221	764	513	8
Elementary Only	4,655	3,339	1,967	1,371	1,028	698
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	434	425	429	430	433	428
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec., and Comm. College	11	9	8	8	7	0
Other			8	8	15	27
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			3,135	2,068		653
Enrollment 100-499			297	268		201
Enrollment Over 500			201	245		309
Total Number of Schools	6,266	5,301	3,887	3,205	2,803	2,437
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	4,421	3,482	2,163	1,379	884	498
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$196	$271	$331	$424	$510	674
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.8%	1.8%	3.5%	3.0%	3.1%	
State	37.4%	38.9%	39.9%	39.7%	40.3%	
Local and Other	60.8%	59.3%	56.6%	57.3%	56.6%	

MISSISSIPPI
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	2,114	2,192	2,104	2,178	2,286	2,357
School Age (5-17)	584	580	607	626	663	614
Public School Enrollments K-12	519	536	531	566	604	600
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	456	471	444	486	527	541
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	4,120	1,989	827	151	150	148
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only	3,440	1,390				
Secondary Only		3				
Elem. and Sec. Only	680	596		151	150	148
Sec. and Community College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99						
Enrollment 100-499						
Enrollment Over 500				151	150	148
Total Number of Schools	5,108	4,224	3,055	1,944	1,424	1,350
Number of 1-Teacher Schools	1,850	1,326	657	192	12	2*
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$71	$96	$157	$206	$249	
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	6.9%	8.8%	7.7%	7.0%	8.2%	22.4%
State	50.8%	45.9%	51.9%	56.5%	57.0%	48.1%
Local and Other	42.3%	45.3%	40.4%	36.5%	34.8%	29.5%

* One of these is a special school for Mentally Retarded

MISSOURI
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	3,892	4,006	4,199	4,320	4,384	4,518
School Age (5-17)	770	776	895	993	1,059	1,129
Public School Enrollments K-12	624	673	742	821	922	1,031
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	532	566	631	705	798	871
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	8,326	4,573	3,431	1,921	1,532	789
Non-Operating				427	372	
Elementary Only	7,649	3,964	2,857	959	798	315
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	677	609	566	529	512	474
Sec. and Community College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College			8	6	2	2
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			2,766	1,290		238
Enrollment 100-499			425	358		250
Enrollment Over 500			240	273		301
Total Number of Schools	7,646	7,002	4,047	3,140	3,137	2,275
Number of 1-Teacher Schools	5,125	2,694	1,970	583	349	56
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$164	$212	$264	$344	$426	$569
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	2.1%	2.9%	4.9%	4.4%	4.3%	9.0%
State	34.4%	35.5%	36.5%	31.0%	32.4%	33.0%
Local and Other	63.5%	61.6%	58.7%	64.6%	63.3%	58.0%

MONTANA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	511	588	628	675	701	693
School Age (5-17)	118	128	153	177	191	208
Public School Enrollments K-12	97	109	128	145	167	172
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	87	97	116	132	150	161
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	1,522	1,386	1,180	1,234	984	840
Non-Operating				188	75	80
Elementary Only	1,340	1,061	1,005	875	741	592
Secondary Only	18	165	15	165	165	164
Elem. and Sec. Only	164	160	158	4	1	1
Sec. and Community College			2	2	2	3
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College					0	0
Other					0	0
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			1,011	1,024	668	504
Enrollment 100-499			124	165	192	197
Enrollment Over 500			45	45	49	59
Total Number of Schools	1,565	1,409	1,239	1,706	1,160	865
Number of 1-Teacher Schools	915	836	820	675	475	297
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$247	$302	$348	$411	$482	$670
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	3.2%	7.3%	5.8%	8.0%	6.5%	7.0%
State	17.8%	25.6%	24.8%	23.6%	25.4%	25.0%
Local and Other	79.0%	67.1%	69.4%	68.4%	68.1%	68.0%

NEBRASKA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	1,283	1,343	1,390	1,411	1,468	
School Age (5-17)	260	272	309	340	369	389
Public School Enrollments K-12	226	233	258	283	321	324
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	200	207	237	260	299	311
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	6,900	6,499	5,340	3,777	2,927	2,172
Non-Operating				522		429
Elementary Only	6,330	6,002	4,878	2,833		1,400
Secondary Only	37	33	29	28		19
Elem. and Sec. Only	533	464	429	390		324
Sec. and Community College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College			4	4		
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			4,974	3,404		1,784
Enrollment 100-499			312	305		292
Enrollment Over 500			54	68		96
Total Number of Schools	5,589	6,526	4,911	3,953	3,253	
Number of 1-Teacher Schools	4,434	4,018	3,431	2,543	1,732	1,033
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$181	$245	$278	$337	$394	$546
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.9%	5.9%	5.0%	4.6%	5.6%	5.6%
State	5.5%	6.6%	6.5%	6.5%	6.4%	18.3%
Local and Other	92.6%	87.5%	88.5%	87.9%	88.0%	76.1%

NEVADA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	164	170	245	285	389	480
School Age (5-17)	33	33	50	66	95	124
Public School Enrollments K-12	26	38	52	66	105	117
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	23	28	44	55	86	109
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	180	177	17	17	17	17
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only	148	151	1	1	1	1
Secondary Only	12	11				
Elem. and Sec. Only	20	15	16	16	16	16
Sec. and Community College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			2	2	2	2
Enrollment 100-499			2	3	1	1
Enrollment Over 500			13	12	14	14
Total Number of Schools	236	215	235	216	225	253
Number of 1-Teacher Schools	88	93	71	38	21	17
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$231	$263	$348	$430	$487	$646
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	7.0%	13.9%	15.2%	8.6%	7.4%	7.8%
State	37.1%	31.3%	41.2%	51.3%	49.8%	45.8%
Local and Other	55.9%	54.8%	43.7%	40.1%	42.7%	46.4%

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	523	535	553	607	644	704
School Age (5-17)	101	105	122	144	159	176
Public School Enrollments K-12	68	76	90	106	124	138
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	62	67	81	96	113	128
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	240	238	229	230	217	183
Non-Operating				12	10	14
Elementary Only	150		148	138	4	5
Secondary Only				1	1	2
Elem. and Sec. Only	90		81	79	202	162
Sec. and Community College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			90	89	69	51
Enrollment 100-499			101	98	88	66
Enrollment Over 500			38	43	60	66
Total Number of Schools	620	578	516	489	477	479
Number of 1-Teacher Schools	133	129	69	41	25	13
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$187	$254	$282	$347	$432	$572
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	2.6%	4.1%	5.9%	5.9%	6.0%	4.6%
State	17.0%	4.9%	5.5%	6.3%	8.3%	7.5%
Local and Other	80.4%	91.0%	88.6%	87.8%	85.7%	87.9%

NEW JERSEY
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	4,768	4,941	5,359	6,067	6,554	
School Age (5-17)	823	865	1,074	1,368	1,558	
Public School Enrollments K-12	631	714	864	1,051	1,250	
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	554	619	766	942	1,125	
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	561	555	566	588	593	568
Non-Operating				41		
Elementary Only	370	362	363	323		
Secondary Only	11	12	16	24		
Elem. and Sec. Only	180	181	186	200		
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College			1			
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99				62	61	
Enrollment 100-499				194	172	
Enrollment Over 500				310	355	
Total No. of Schools	1,815	1,779	1,917	1,975	2,153	
No. of 1-Teahcer Schools	89	20	10	1	2	
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$251	$312	$382	$488	$579	
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.1%	2.4%	2.5%	2.5%	2.6%	
State	16.2%	12.5%	24.2%	23.7%	21.8%	
Local and Other	81.7%	85.1%	73.4%	73.8%	75.6%	

NEW MEXICO
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	571	709	792	951	986	
School Age (5-17)	158	184	218	273	294	
Public School Enrollments K-12	136	159	186	231	266	
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	108	129	161	202	235	
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	530	405	243	157	103	89
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only					0	0
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only					103	89
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99				2		
Enrollment 100-499				30		30
Enrollment Over 500				59		59
Total No. of Schools	818	764	790	679	683	670
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	263	168	96	64	26	14
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$186	$261	$318	$363	$466	
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	2.2%	11.3%	12.7%	14.0%	10.5%	11.0%
State	87.5%	76.6%	64.9%	74.4%	68.5%	77.0%
Local and Other	10.3%	12.1%	22.4%	11.6%	20.9%	12.0%

NEW YORK
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	14,231	14,916	15,481	16,782	17,696	
School Age (5-17)	2,473	2,577	3,160	3,645	4,037	
Public School Enrollments K-12	1,922	2,059	2,467	2,829	3,050	
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	1,628	1,772	2,115	2,464	2,796	
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	4,609	3,175	1,981	1,340	1,203	932
Non-Operating				404		
Elementary Only	3,892	2,485	1,290	239		
Secondary Only	4	4		4		
Elem. and Sec. Only	713	686	681	680		
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other			10	13		
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			1,121	538		
Enrollment 100-499			266	174		
Enrollment Over 500			594	628		
Total No. of Schools	7,198	6,305	5,136	5,125	4,501	
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	1,494	775	280	57	85	
Current Expenditures Per Pupil in A.D.A. (k-12)	$257	$352	$426	$562	$744	
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.0%	1.1%	2.0%	1.9%	2.1%	
State	32.6%	40.5%	35.7%	39.5%	43.0%	
Local and Other	66.4%	58.4%	62.3%	58.6%	54.9%	

NORTH CAROLINA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	3,798	4,146	4,327	4,556	4,787	5,024
School Age (5-17)	992	1,042	1,154	1,248	1,305	1,339
Public School Enrollments K-12	848	914	1,023	1,105	1,187	1,218
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	751	816	927	1,003	1,082	1,115
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	172	172	174	174	171	160
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only						
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	172	172	171	169	164	147
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College			3	5	7	13
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99						
Enrollment 100-499						
Enrollment Over 500	172	172	174	174	171	160
Total No. of Schools	4,703	3,414	3,078	2,919	2,689	2,394
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	595	226	92	26	18	0
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$109	$176	$189	$237	$318	$464
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	9.0%	7.1%	6.1%	6.0%	6.1%	13.6%
State	66.2%	67.9%	69.0%	66.7%	67.6%	62.8%
Local and Other	24.8%	25.0%	24.9%	27.3%	26.3%	23.6%

NORTH DAKOTA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	582	602	639	632	645	
School Age (5-17)	143	146	167	172	178	
Public School Enrollments K-12	113	117	126	137	145	
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	101	105	117	126	136	
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	2,267	2,135	2,032	1,351	709	430
Non-Operating				297		
Elementary Only	1,855		1,660	723		
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	412		372	331		
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99				1,095		
Enrollment 100-499				200		
Enrollment Over 500				56		
Total No. of Schools	3,710	3,204	2,847	1,763	1,214	
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	2,677	2,601	2,221	1,143	390	
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$182	$256	$287	$367	$425	
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.6%	2.4%	4.2%	4.6%	7.3%	
State	26.3%	27.4	25.8%	26.4%	23.9%	
Local and Other	72.1%	70.2%	70.0%	69.0%	68.9%	

OHIO
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	7,842	8,063	8,981	9,706	10,000	
School Age (5-17)	1,513	1,557	1,968	2,369	2,608	2,760
Public School Enrollments K-12	1,152	1,303	1,617	1,906	2,113	2,251
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	1,046	1,170	1,468	1,736	2,025	2,251
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	1,579	1,429	1,254	936	800	714
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only	522	432	319	114		36
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	1,057	997	935	822		694
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollments 0-99			75	32		11
Enrollments 100-499			412	260		46
Enrollments Over 500			605	644		638
Total No. of Schools	4,356	4,093	4,083	4,137	4,135	4,244
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	446	200	76	15	6	2
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$191	$232	$283	$365	$434	$565
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.3%	1.7%	3.8%	3.1%	3.2%	3.2%
State	39.6%	30.6%	30.0%	27.7%	25.9%	25.4%
Local and Other	59.1%	67.6%	66.2%	69.2%	70.9%	71.4%

OKLAHOMA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	2,295	2,262	2,191	2,328	2,441	2,500
School Age (5-17)	534	515	537	572	606	595
Public School Enrollments K-12	456	510	502	534	586	619
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	400	405	453	486	533	559
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	2,712	2,066	1,716	1,322	1,114	705
Non-Operating				9		
Elementary Only	1,953	1,314	1,047	727	577	244
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	759	752	663	580	537	461
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College			6	6		5
Other						8
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99				740	584	373
Enrollment 100-499				427	340	364
Enrollment Over 500				155	190	190
Total No. of Schools	3,489	3,520	3,281	2,796	2,605	2,289
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	1,323	955	602	305	178	0
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$144	$226	$249	$311	$354	$483
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	3.2%	4.1%	7.4%	8.5%	10.6%	13%
State	50.1%	67.9%	43.1%	27.7%	31.6%	35%
Local and Other	46.7%	48.0%	49.5%	63.8%	57.8%	52%

OREGON
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	1,405	1,582	1,694	1,769	1,886	2,010
School Age (5-17)	283	323	403	458	513	536
Public School Enrollments K-12	241	283	338	389	446	484
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	206	243	298	345	396	425
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	1,363	995	716	572	424	367
Non-operating				12	7	5
Elementary Only	1,113	760	516	372	233	181
Secondary Only	115	107	70	61	41	31
Elem. and Sec. Only	135	128	130	126	141	149
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec., and Comm. College				1	2	1
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			381	252		
Enrollment 100-499			220	194		
Enrollment Over 500			115	126		
Total No. of Schools	1,449	1,317	1,309	1,289	1,289	1,302
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	399	194	132	79	30	
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$217	$316	$357	$441	$549	$715
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.7%	3.0%	2.8%	4.3%	4.2%	
State	37.4%	30.6%	27.2%	29.0%	31.6%	
Local and Other	60.9%	66.4%	70.0%	66.7%	64.2%	

PENNSYLVANIA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL-YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	10,478	10,551	10,878	11,319	11,425	12,200
School Age (5-17)	2,072	2,064	2,352	2,627	2,770	2,800
Public School Enrollments K-12	1,515	1,589	1,774	1,928	2,156	2,250
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	1,361	1,424	1,610	1,789	1,985	2,000
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	2,540	2,514	1,410	986	1,005	499
Non-Operating				28		0
Elementary Only	1,424	974	628	254		0
Secondary Only			81	48		0
Elem. and Sec. Only	1,116	1,540	701	654		499
Sec. and Comm. College					0	0
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College				2	0	0
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			235	92		0
Enrollment 100-499			265	174		1
Enrollment Over 500			810	720		498
Total No. of Schools	8,362	7,450	5,527	5,185	4,752	4,586
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	2,744	1,954	693	247	84	27
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$184	$264	$333	$409	$478	$550
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.1%	2.3%	2.2%	3.0%	2.6%	2.6%
State	35.9%	34.1%	46.0%	45.8%	42.9%	50.1%
Local and Other	63.0%	63.6%	51.8%	51.2%	54.5%	49.3%

RHODE ISLAND
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	745	792	827	859	892	913
School Age (5-17)	134	141	166	192	211	217
Public School Enrollments K-12	94	101	117	133	153	167
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	81	86	103	118	136	153
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	39	39	39	39	41	40
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only	10	11	17	10		6
Secondary Only						1
Elem. and Sec. Only	29	28	22	29		33
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			1	1		1
Enrollment 100-499			9	8		6
Enrollment Over 500			29	30		33
Total No. of Schools	384	365	359	350	358	369
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	25	20	2	6	1	1
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$221	$259	$325	$413	$492	$640
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	2.1%	3.9%	5.5%	6.5%	5.7%	3.4%
State	19.4%	14.4%	15.9%	23.2%	30.4%	29.2%
Local and Other	78.5%	81.7%	78.6%	70.3%	63.9%	67.4%

SOUTH CAROLINA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	1,982	2,159	2,297	2,383	2,504	2,657
School Age (5-17)	554	576	653	698	729	778
Public School Enrollments K-12	459	512	563	610	655	666
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	375	427	482	531	583	605
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	1,680	521	107	108	108	105
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only	1,233					
Secondary Only	21					
Elem. and Sec. Only	426	521	107	108	108	105
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99						
Enrollment 100-499				1	1	1
Enrollment Over 500			103	107	108	104
Total No. of Schools	3,885	3,365	1,703	1,419	1,394	1,368
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	1,019	678	68	10	5	0
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$112	$154	$188	$220	$278	$387
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	8.3%	8.5%	4.8%	6.0%	7.6%	18%
State	60.7%	57.3%	74.5%	66.7%	66.2%	55%
Local and Other	31.0%	34.2%	20.7%	27.3%	26.2%	27%

SOUTH DAKOTA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	611	647	680	681	708	699
School Age (5-17)	140	143	166	179	200	192
Public School Enrollments K-12	115	121	137	154	170	176
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	101	107	120	138	155	160
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	3,409	3,390	3,295	3,070	2,873	1,797
Non-Operating				994	1,190	610
Elementary Only	3,122	3,118	3,025	1,821	1,439	972
Secondary Only	6	5	4	3	3	4
Elem. and Sec. Only	281	267	266	252	241	211
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99				2,837	2,631	1,579
Enrollment 100-499				219	178	157
Enrollment Over 500				14	64	61
Total No. of Schools	3,720	3,699	3,355	3,849	2,323	1,709
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	3,203	2,926	2,638	3,130	1,530	895
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$194	$251	$309	$347	$393	$536
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.0%	4.4%	6.0%	9.0%	9.7%	11.0%
State	17.5%	11.7%	10.1%	8.9%	9.2%	11.0%
Local and Other	81.5%	83.9%	83.9%	82.1%	81.1%	78.0%

TENNESSEE
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	3,179	3,302	3,399	3,567	3,747	3,975
School Age (5-17)	771	777	867	921	977	1,000
Public School Enrollments K-12	628	677	754	810	885	907
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	548	595	678	736	810	831
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	150	150	152	153	154	151
Non-Operating						0
Elementary Only	26	22	20	21	20	19
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	124	128	132	132	134	132
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem. Sec., and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99						
Enrollment 100-499			7	8	10	8
Enrollment Over 500			145	145	144	143
Total No. of Schools	5,397	4,327	3,541	3,032	2,595	1,934
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	2,095	1,323	779	421	186	32
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$108	$148	$189	$238	$296	$461
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	12.8%	8.0%	7.2%	6.9%	8.1%	15.9%
State	51.7%	55.4%	58.7%	58.0%	57.2%	47.9%
Local and Other	34.5%	36.6%	34.1%	35.1%	34.7%	36.2%

TEXAS
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	7,371	8,077	8,770	9,580	10,228	10,945
School Age (5-17)	1,663	1,711	2,094	2,477	2,737	2,772
Public School Enrollments K-12	1,279	1,468	1,760	2,068	2,365	2,615
A.D.A. In Public Schools K-12	1,075	1,257	1,536	1,822	2,124	2,341
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	2,925	2,281	1,889	1,581	1,421	1,247
Non-Operating				28		9
Elementary Only	1,526	1,020	695	457		180
Secondary Only			1	1		
Elem. and Sec. Only	1,399	1,261	1,161	1,095		942
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College			32			
Other						118
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			616	426		216
Enrollment 100-499			736	620		407
Enrollment Over 500			537	535		616
Total No. of Schools	8,064	7,513	5,845	5,668	5,811	5,344
No. of 1-Teacher Schools						
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$165	$223	$265	$332	$397	$486
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	5.6%	4.6%	4.8%	5.2%	4.6%	10.7%
State	50.0%	58.4%	53.9%	49.9%	55.1%	47.7%
Local and Other	44.4%	37.0%	41.3%	44.9%	39.4%	41.6%

UTAH
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	670	706	799	891	971	1,000
School Age (5-17)	168	177	215	256	289	309
Public School Enroolments K-12	144	168	198	236	277	299
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	133	153	181	216	256	282
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	40	40	40	40	40	40
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only						
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	40	40	40	40	40	40
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99						
Enrollment 100-499			4	5	5	5
Enrollment Over 500			36	35	35	35
Total No. of Schools	506	506	554	554	553	565
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	28	25	25	16	8	5
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$179	$196	$241	$322	$395	$505
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	4.2%	4.9%	5.7%	5.4%	6.0%	8.1%
State	45.5%	38.6%	37.8%	44.1%	49.8%	47.2%
Local and Other	50.3%	56.4%	56.5%	50.5%	44.2%	44.7%

VERMONT
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	363	373	366	390	405	430
School Age (5-17)	79	81	89	98	105	109
Public School Enrollments K-12	56	64	71	73	80	95
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	53	58	64	70	75	85
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	268	263	260	263	269	282
Non-Operating				9		6
Elementary Only	183	182	181	175		186
Secondary Only			2	5		15
Elem. and Sec. Only	85	81	77	74		49
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			114	94		100
Enrollment 100-499			121	136		115
Enrollment Over 500			25	33		54
Total No. of Schools	997	882	705	487	432	443
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	571	430	286	86	47	55
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$167	$220	$263	$344	$436	$673
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	3.6%	5.0%	4.9%	3.5%	3.5%	4.0%
State	25.5%	21.7%	25.7%	24.7%	24.0%	22.5%
Local and Other	70.9%	73.3%	69.4%	61.8%	72.5%	73.5%

VIRGINIA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	3,051	3,437	3,570	3,967	4,282	4,602
School Age (5-17)	696	748	865	1,006	1,114	1,188
Public School Enrollments K-12	561	639	750	842	968	1,053
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	497	558	668	756	873	950
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	125	127	129	127	130	131
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only			1			
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	125	127	128	127	130	131
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99						0
Enrollment 100-499						0
Enrollment Over 500	125	127	128	127	130	131
Total No. of Schools	4,055	3,149	2,664	2,349	2,121	1,846
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	1,178	798	424	241	93	12
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$125	$169	$214	$274	$360	
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	4.2%	6.1%	13.8%	11.0%	9.5%	
State	42.8%	41.1%	34.9%	37.0%	40.6%	
Local and Other	53.0%	52.8%	51.3%	52.0%	49.9%	

WASHINGTON
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000'S)						
Total Population	2,463	2,420	2,618	2,853	2,961	
School Age (5-17)	464	472	592	712	765	
Public School Enrollments K-12	396	466	561	609	699	804
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	324	385	475	569	658	
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	628	560	502	425	399	337
Non-Operating				8	11	10
Elementary Only	322	253	241	166	135	85
Secondary Only	6		3	2	1	0
Elem. and Sec. Only	300	307	248	239	250	249
Sec. and Comm. College			1	1		
Elem.,Sec. and Comm. College			9	9		22
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			201	139		42
Enrollment 100-499			147	164		81
Enrollment Over 500			154	164		214
Total No. of Schools	1,566	1,400	1,534	1,621	1,638	1,797
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	628	560	502	425	399	17
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$237	$284	$332	$420	$510	$605
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	1.8%	7.1%	7.0%	4.9%	5.0%	
State	62.7%	61.1%	53.7%	61.6%	61.2%	
Local and Other	35.5%	31.9%	39.3%	33.5%	33.8%	

WEST VIRGINIA
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	1,911	1,989	1,965	1,860	1,813	
School Age (5-17)	499	498	537	506	490	
Public School Enrollments K-12	423	441	457	460	439	420
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	380	396	416	421	411	380
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	55	55	55	55	55	55
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only						
Secondary Only						
Elem. and Sec. Only	55	55	55	55	55	55
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99						
Enrollment 100-499						
Enrollment Over 500	55	55	55	55	55	55
Total No. of Schools	4,526	4,089	3,470	2,843	2,104	1,491
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	2,528	2,106	1,503	946	399	73
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$142	$183	$197	$258	$320	
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	4.8%	3.8%	4.6%	4.9%	4.9%	
State	64.0%	64.3%	59.5%	52.9%	52.7%	
Local and Other	31.2%	31.9%	35.9%	42.2%	42.4%	

WISCONSIN
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	3,300	3,481	3,704	3,952	4,066	
School Age (5-17)	678	714	846	984	1,063	
Public School Enrollments K-12	491	520	596	699	817	
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	444	467	547	616	722	
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	6,038	5,463	3,874	2,877	739	488
Non-Operating				23		16
Elementary Only	5,599	5,040	3,453	2,440		83
Secondary Only	81	69	79	80		17
Elem. and Sec. Only	358	354	342	334		372
Sec. and Comm. College						
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College						
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			3,270	2,215		
Enrollment 100-499			423	420		
Enrollment Over 500			181	242		
Total No. of Schools	7,000	6,496	5,141	4,758	3,070	
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	4,336	3,871	3,074	2,314	582	
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$191	$285	$334	$413	$514	
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	2.3%	2.6%	3.8%	2.9%	3.1%	
State	19.6%	16.3%	19.4%	22.6%	25.9%	
Local and Other	78.1%	81.1%	76.8%	75.5%	71.0%	

WYOMING
Basic Statistical
Profile

FISCAL YEAR	1948	1952	1956	1960	1964	1968
POPULATION FIGURES (IN 1000's)						
Total Population	285	298	311	330	339	
School Age (5-17)	61	65	76	87	92	
Public School Enrollments K-12	55	62	70	81	93	
A.D.A. in Public Schools K-12	48	50	64	71	82	
NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY TYPE						
Total	356	313	256	223	200	174
Non-Operating						
Elementary Only	265	227	169	148		
Secondary Only	15	16	12	12		
Elem. and Sec. Only	76	70	71	63		
Sec. and Comm. College			1			
Elem., Sec. and Comm. College			3			
Other						
NUMBER OF DISTRICTS BY SIZE						
Enrollment 0-99			171	134		
Enrollment 100-499			60	62		
Enrollment Over 500			25	27		
Total No. of Schools	657	696	674	583	497	
No. of 1-Teacher Schools	385	376	331	253	142	
Current Expenditures per Pupil in A.D.A. (K-12)	$195	$311	$345	$450	$532	
PERCENTAGE REVENUE RECEIPTS						
Federal	3.9%	14.4%	3.4%	4.7%	5.2%	
State	29.6%	34.4%	39.5%	47.5%	41.3%	
Local and Other	66.5%	51.1%	57.1%	47.8%	53.4%	

Special Study Satellite Projects

Special
Study No.

1. EARLY CHILDHOOD AND BASIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION -- Needs, Programs, Demands, Costs
   William P. McLure and Audra May Pence
2. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN: Resource Configurations and Costs
   Richard A. Rossmiller, James A. Hale and Lloyd E. Frohreich
3. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR THE CULTURALLY DEPRIVED -- Need and Cost Differentials
   Arvid J. Burke, James A. Kelly and Walter I. Garms
4. FINANCING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS
   Erick L. Lindman and Arthur Berchin
5. ADULT AND CONTINUING EDUCATION: Needs, Programs and Costs
   J. Alan Thomas
6. THE COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE: Target Population, Program Costs, and Cost Differentials
   James L. Wattenbarger, Bob N. Cage and L. H. Arney
7. FINANCING PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES
   W. Monfort Barr, K. Forbis Jordan, C. Cale Hudson, Wendell J. Peterson and William R. Wilkerson
8. SCHOOL FOOD SERVICE AND NUTRITION EDUCATION -- Status, Needs, Projections, Costs --
   Robert J. Garvue, Thelma G. Flanagan and William H. Castine
9. PUPIL TRANSPORTATION
   Dewey H. Stollar
10. FISCAL CAPACITY AND EDUCATIONAL FINANCE: Variations Among States, School Districts and Municipalities
    Richard A. Rossmiller, James A. Hale and Lloyd E. Frohreich
11. THE RELATIONSHIP OF SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION TO STATE AID DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS
    Clifford P. Hooker and Van D. Mueller

END